DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 059 761 PS 005 348

TITLE	White House Conference on Children--Child Development Recommendations. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Children and Youth of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, 92nd Congress.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.
PUB DATE	Apr 71
NOTE	206p.; First Session on Child Development Recommendations of the White House Conference on Children, April 26-27, 1971
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$9.87
DESCRIPTORS	Bilingualism; Child Care; *Child Development; Childhood Needs; *Conferences; Creative Expression; Cultural Enrichment; Federal Programs; Financial Needs; Financial Support; *Government Role; Health Services; Income; Laws; *Legislators; Public Schools; Racial Attitudes; *Youth
IDENTIFIERS	*White House Conference on Children

ABSTRACT

Senate hearings on child development and child care programs are presented. Specific subjects covered include comprehensive, family-oriented child development programs, the development of programs to eliminate racism, reordering of national priorities beginning with a guaranteed basic family income adequate for the needs of children, improving the nation's system of child justice, a federally financed national child health care program, a system of early identification of children with special needs, establishment of a child advocacy agency, establishment of a cabinet post of children and youth, the bilingual-bicultural growth of all children, funding of alternative optional forms of public education, and the provision of opportunities for every child to learn, grow, and live creatively by reordering national priorities. (CK)

ED 059761

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN— CHILD DEVELOPMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-SECOND CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

CHILD DEVELOPMENT RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN

APRIL 26 AND 27, 1971

Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

PS 005348

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
67-582 O WASHINGTON : 1971

80 02412

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., New Jersey, *Chairman*

JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia
CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin
WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota
THOMAS F. EAGLETON, Missouri
ALAN CRANSTON, California
HAROLD E. HUGHES, Iowa
ADLAI E. STEVENSON III, Illinois

JACOB K. JAVITS, New York
WINSTON L. PROUTY, Vermont
PETER H. DOMINICK, Colorado
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Pennsylvania
BOB PACKWOOD, Oregon
ROBERT TAFT, JR., Ohio
J. GLENN BEALL, JR., Maryland

STEWART E. MCCLURE, *Staff Director*
ROBERT E. NAGLE, *General Counsel*
ROY H. MILLENSON, *Minority Staff Director*
EUGENE MITTELMAN, *Minority Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota, *Chairman*

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, New Jersey
JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin
ALAN CRANSTON, California
ADLAI E. STEVENSON III, Illinois

ROBERT TAFT, JR., Ohio
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Pennsylvania
BOB PACKWOOD, Oregon
J. GLENN BEALL, JR., Maryland
JACOB K. JAVITS, New York

A. SIDNEY JOHNSON III, *Professional Staff Member*
JOHN K. SCALES, *Minority Counsel*

CONTENTS

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WITNESSES

MONDAY, APRIL 26, 1971

	Page
Hess, Stephen, Chairman, White House Conference on Children and Youth	4
Bronfenbrenner, Dr. Urie, Professor of Human Development and Family Studies, New York State College of Human Ecology, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.	33

TUESDAY, APRIL 27, 1971

Kagan, Dr. Jerome, Chairman, White House Conference Forum on "Developmental Day-Care Services for Children"	64
Lansburg, Mrs. Therese, Vice Chairman, White House Conference Forum on "Developmental Day-Care Services for Children"; accompanied by Theodore T. Taylor, Executive Director, Day-Care and Child Development Council of America	77

STATEMENTS

Bronfenbrenner, Dr. Urie, Professor of Human Development and Family Studies, New York State College of Human Ecology, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.	33
Hess, Stephen, Chairman, White House Conference on Children and Youth	4
Kagan, Dr. Jerome, Chairman, White House Conference Forum on "Developmental Day-Care Services for Children"	64
Prepared statement	75
Lansburgh, Mrs. Therese, Vice Chairman, White House Conference Forum on "Developmental Day-Care Services for Children"; accompanied by Theodore T. Taylor, Executive Director, Day-Care and Child Development Council of America	77

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Articles, publications, etc.:	
"Development Research and Public Policy," by Dr. Urie Bronfenbrenner, Professor of Human Development and Family Studies, New York State College of Human Ecology at Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.	46
1970 White House Conference on Children Back-Up Statements of Major Recommendations	15
Communications to:	
Mondale, Hon. Walter F., a U.S. Senator from the State of Minnesota, from: Edward M. Kennedy, a U.S. Senator from the State of Massachusettes, April 26, 1971	63
Selected tables:	
Results of balloting by the delegates to the 1970 White House Conference on Children on Overriding Concerns and Specific Recommendations Overriding Concerns	10

APPENDIX

Selected excerpts from the Report of the White House Conference on Children	95

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN—CHILD DEVELOPMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

MONDAY, APRIL 26, 1971

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH
OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to call, in room 4232, NSOB, Senator Walter F. Mondale (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Mondale, Taft, and Javits.

Staff members present: A. Sidney Johnson III, professional staff member; John K. Scales, minority counsel.

Senator MONDALE. The committee will come to order.

We begin today the first series of hearings of the Subcommittee on Children and Youth.

These hearings start with a followup to the White House Conference on Children. They will explore the Conference findings in general, and focus on the Conference recommendations concerning child development specifically, since developmental day care services for children was chosen by the Conference delegates as their top priority.

I doubt there is a more appropriate subject than child development to initiate the subcommittee's investigation of the problems and potentials of children and youth. For we are finally recognizing the critical and lasting developmental effects of the first few years of life—when the foundations are laid for a child's feelings of self-worth, his sense of self-respect, his motivation, initiative, ability to learn and achieve.

I am particularly pleased that these initial hearings involve the White House Conference on Children. One of the major reasons for the creation of this subcommittee was our desire to provide a followup mechanism to the White House Conferences on Children and Youth.

These conferences have been held every decade in this century. But their excellent and urgent recommendations have largely been ignored. Many of us have felt for some time that action mechanisms designed to implement the essential proposals of these Conferences are needed in both the Congress and the executive branch.

I hope this new subcommittee can help fill this void—and that through our work we can help assure children and youth the priority they deserve—but have never received.

Our subcommittee is fortunate to have a superb set of witnesses to help us begin our investigations and fulfill our responsibilities. They

include some of our most committed and most pioneering advocates of children.

Today, we will receive testimony from Mr. Stephen Hess, National Chairman of White House Conference on Children and Youth, and Dr. Urie Bronfenbrenner, Chairman of the White House Conference Forum on "Children and Parents: Together in the World."

Tomorrow, Dr. Jerome Kagan, Chairman of the White House Conference Forum on "Developmental Day Care Services for Children," and Mrs. Therese W. Lansburgh, Vice Chairman of that forum will testify.

Although our first witness, Mr. Hess, served as Chairman of the White House Conferences on Children and on Youth, and last week's Conference on Youth is still fresh in our minds, I hope we can focus our questions and inquiries on the work of the White House Conference on Children.

This initial hearing is designed to deal primarily with the child development work of the Children's Conference. I hope we can hold followup hearings to the White House Conference on Youth at a later time.

I have a statement here which I am going to read from the chairman of the full committee, Senator Williams, because I think it shows the seriousness with which he views the work of this subcommittee.

I quote him:

"This is a historic day for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. In the past, the subcommittees of our committee have been organized so as to represent and act upon the needs of millions of Americans.

"During the past 2 or 3 years we have learned that one major portion of our society has not been adequately represented in the councils of the Government, our Nation's youth.

"On several occasions in the past I have called for a creation of a Senate unit to deal with this and when I had the opportunity of becoming chairman of this committee, I found myself with the unique opportunity to accomplish this important objective.

"My first act when the committee was organized was to announce the formation of a subcommittee specifically devoted to the needs and concerns of our young people, the Subcommittee on Children and Youth.

"At the same time, I found myself with the additional good fortune to have Senator Mondale enthusiastically agree to serve as chairman of this subcommittee. The jurisdiction is directed to him of the important concerns about our youth, education, health, and manpower and drug abuse, all directly affect the lives of all young people.

"Yet, we must also find a way to talk directly with those most intimately involved, young Americans themselves. The vital issues within the concern of the committee are different in urban centers from what they are in small towns and rural America. Therefore, we must hear from all parts of America and we must do as we are doing today, we must hear from those who have professional and personal concerns about the children and youth of America.

"This new subcommittee can play an important role in meeting the challenges and opportunities which we will face in the coming

years. This is a job that must be done, which I know will be undertaken with excellence and with the bright hopes which all of us hold for our children's future."

I have read this because it is a fact that Senator Williams for some years has sought the creation of the subcommittee which begins its work this morning. It adds greatly, I think, to the optimism which many of us share for the work of this subcommittee that has the enthusiastic endorsement and support of the chairman of the full committee.

May I say in that regard that I am very grateful that the ranking minority member of this committee, our new and able Senator from Ohio, Senator Robert Taft, is here. I think that this effort can only work if it is bipartisan.

After all, the concerns and needs of children and youth should not be a partisan matter; they deserve the enlightened and committed concern of all Americans. I am truly grateful that you have agreed to serve as the ranking minority member, and I look forward to working with you on this subcommittee.

Senator TAFT. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I certainly appreciate your kind statement and I look forward with great interest and pleasure to working with you in connection with the work of this subcommittee.

I commend its establishment and I consider myself particularly fortunate to have been selected as the ranking minority member in this very important and, I think, often too much overlooked area of our national concern.

It is indeed a pleasure to have an opportunity to work with the Senator from Minnesota whom I have known in other ways over the years and I am sure we can have some very interesting hearings. I certainly concur that partisanship in this area is something that is pretty remote.

The best interests of children and youth in our Nation today, they have so many problems that completely transcend any party or perhaps philosophical barrier that might otherwise arise in political questions.

I am hopeful that in the months ahead we will have the opportunity to participate in a meaningful exchange of ideas covering the broad range of issues concerning young people. I believe very firmly that the understanding of and communication with the genuine concerns of young people is essential to the progress and well-being of our Nation.

I want to welcome our distinguished witnesses today who were participants in the White House Conference—the National Chairman, Stephen Hess, and Dr. Urie Bronfenbrenner. I look forward to working with each of you in the future and I look forward to hearing your testimony this morning.

Senator MONDALE. Thank you very much, Senator Taft.

Senator JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to join with the chairman as we commence these first hearings of the Subcommittee on Children and Youth.

Its establishment is a significant milestone in the development of children's rights, which have evolved from freeing them from the factories and mines of the early industrial revolution, to a pinning down of our society's affirmative obligation to provide children with a basic

education and hopefully enactment this year of legislation establishing a basic level of support.

It is my hope that through these hearings and the consideration of legislation proposals made by me, Senator Mondale, and other members of this subcommittee and the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty, that early child development will soon be established as a universal right of the family which this Nation must begin to honor.

There are 26,129,000 preschool children in the Nation, including more than 3,000,000 preschool children of low-income families. There are also more than 33.2 million children between the ages of 6 and 13 including 5.9 million children in low-income families.

We must begin to expand our knowledge and our programs to serve in the coming decade an ever-increasing number of these children, and we must serve them in such a way as to contribute not only to their own development, but to the goals of integration and racial harmony.

We are very fortunate that the administration both in terms of program content and increased funding have given great attention to Headstart and similar programs from which we have learned so much. As President Nixon himself has stated in his February 19, 1969, message to the Congress:

> So crucial is the matter of early growth that we must make a national commitment to providing all American children an opportunity for healthful and stimulating development during the first five years of life.

I hope that this day will make the beginning of a creative bipartisan partnership, reaching toward the goal of the White House Conference on Children for the establishment of:

> . . . effective procedures for implementation and administration of child development programs by which all available or committed resources can be identified, coordinating and harmonized into a national effort having as its goal the enhanced development of the American child through the remaining years of the 20th century.

And of course that goal, of providing for children, even if attained cannot be maintained unless we concern ourselves equally with the very special and complex problems of youth, which have just been highlighted by the White House Conference held just last week.

I welcome Mr. Stephen Hess, National Chairman of the Conference, who has brought attention to these crucial matters and Dr. Urie Bronfenbrenner, who as one of the pioneers in this field and most recently in connection with the Conference and his work at Cornell University, has contributed so very much to our store of knowledge on the subject.

Senator MONDALE. Our first witness this morning is Mr. Stephen Hess, National Chairman, White House Conference on Children and Youth, Washington, D.C. We are delighted to have you here with us this morning.

STATEMENT OF STEPHEN HESS, CHAIRMAN, WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

Mr. HESS. Mr. Chairman, Senator Taft, I am Stephen Hess, National Chairman of the White House Conference on Children and Youth, and I consider it a singular honor to have been invited by you to be the first witness at the first public hearing of the Subcom-

mittee on Children and Youth of the U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

This subcommittee, in my opinion, can become a major conduit through which the needs and concerns of 55 million young Americans can be heard in the Congress and the Nation.

Speaking for the White House Conference, Mr. Chairman, we salute your determination to see that a mechanism within the Senate should exist to review the recommendations of these important decennial meetings. With the creation of this subcommittee, under your leadership, such a body is now operational and I pledge you the full cooperation of the Conference staff.

It was the recommendation of last December's White House Conference on Children "that Congress establish a Joint Committee on Children and Youth to oversee the entire range of Federal programs and concerns relating to children and youth." Clearly, this subcommittee is the first step in realizing this goal.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the White House Conference on Children and Youth is a venerable institution in American life which has been meeting once each decade since it was created by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1909, and which has recommended to the Nation most of the major pieces of child-centered legislation in this century.

The Children's Conference met last December 13–18 at which time over 3,700 delegates debated a series of issues organized around six cluster areas: Individuality; Learning; Health; Parents and Families; Communities and Environment; and Laws, Rights, and Responsibilities.

At this time, I would like to present to you and Senator Taft, the distinguished ranking minority member, bound copies of the Conference program and copies of our publication, "Profiles of Children."

Senator MONDALE. Thank you very much for those documents.

Exerpts from this volume and other relevant materials from the White House Conference on Children will appear in the record as an appendix to the hearings.

Mr. HESS. On the final day of the Conference, the delegates voted on a series of 16 issues of "overriding concern" and 25 specific recommendations. I would like to place the results of this balloting in the record at this point and perhaps review the first five with you.

Senator MONDALE. That document attached to your testimony will be included in the record at the conclusion of your remarks.

Mr. HESS. Of particular interest to this subcommittee is that the following recommendations—by weighted vote—was declared the No. 1 priority among child-related issues for this decade:

We recommend that the Federal Government fund comprehensive child care programs, which will be family centered, locally controlled, and universally available, with the initial priority to those whose needs are greatest.

These programs should provide for active participation of family members in the development and implementation of the program. These programs, including health, early childhood education, and social services should have sufficient variety to insure that families can select the options most appropriate to their needs.

A major educational program should also be provided to inform the public about the elements essential for quality in child care services, about the inadequacies of custodial care, and the nature of the importance of child care services as a supplement, not a substitute, for the family as the primary agent for the child's development as a human being.

PS 00548

Federal funding must be available immediately for the first year for spaces for 500,000 children, increasing 250,000 spaces per year until it reaches all families who seek it and all children who need it.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read the conference preamble, which, I am sure, you could also take as the preamble for this subcommittee and the important work which you begin today. This was drafted by the chairmen of the 25 forums.

As we begin this significant national reassessment, let us remind ourselves of our purpose. This should be a conference about love, about our need to love those to whom we have given birth and those who are most helpless and in need, and those who give us a reason for being, and those who are most precious for themselves, for what they are and what they can become, our children.

Let us ask what we want for our children, then let us ask not less for all children. We want for our children a home of love and understanding and encouragement. We want for our children a full opportunity for learning in an environment in which they can reach and grow and take pride in themselves.

We want for our children the right to be healthy, to be free of sickness. But if sickness comes, to have the best care humanly possible. We want for our children the right to have the respect of others. We want them to have respect and dignity as a right because they are, not because of who their parents are.

We want for our children to live under laws that are fair and just and that are administered fairly and justly. We want for our children to love their country because their country has earned their love, because their country strives to create peace and to create the conditions of a humane and healthy society for all of its citizens and is dedicating the resources necessary to redeem its commitment to these ends.

This we want for our children. Therefore this we must want for all children. There can be no exceptions. To those who have food, it is intolerable that there is a child somewhere in our land who is ill-nourished.

To those who live beneath a sound roof, it is intolerable that there should be a child who is ill-housed and without adequate clothes.

That we are well, so then it is intolerable that a child is needlessly sick or lives in an environmeat that poisons his body or mind. That we have the knowledge, so then it is intolerable that there is some child who does not have a full opportunity to learn.

That we are a nation founded on equality, so must we not tolerate intolerance in ourselves or our fellows. We must recognize that there is some child in special need. And he especially must be our child.

At a time when it is all too easy to accuse, to blame, to fault, let us gather in trust and faith to put before the nation that which is necessary and best. All this we say with the greatest sense of urgency and conviction.

Our children and our families are in deep trouble. A society that neglects its children and fears its youth cannot care about its future. Surely this is the way to national disaster. Our society has the capacity to care and the resources to act. Act we must.

There is a need to change our patterns of living so that once again we will bring adults back into the lives of children and children back into the lives of adults. The changes must come at all levels of society, in business, industry, mass media, schools, government, communities, neighborhoods and above all, in ourselves. The changes must come now.

We, as delegates to the 1970 White House Conference on Children do now affirm our total commitment to help bring our nation into a new age of caring. Now we begin.

Senator MONDALE. Thank you for an excellent statement. As you indicated in your testimony, each decade in this century there has been a White House Conference on Children and Youth and each of them have produced very impressive recommendations as has the last one.

Yet, I think it is fair to say that most of these recommendations have been wanting for implementation. Would you care to speculate why this has been, how you think we might organize ourselves to see that it not happen this time, and as a part of that what kinds of mechanisms

have been implemented or will be implemented to follow up the recently concluded White House Conference on Children?

Mr. HESS. Of course, on the Federal legislative level, the creation of this committee is certainly by far the most encouraging and hopeful sign. On the executive side of the Federal Government I will propose certain mechanisms as well, to the President.

These will be in the report which should be out within 2 weeks and it would certainly be my hope that the President would choose to make the Office of Child Development under the leadership of the very distinguished Yale professor, Dr. Edward Zigler, as the focal point for this effort.

I think it does not make sense for an ad hoc body such as the White House Conference staff to continue this role. There should be a place in Government where responsibility permanently lies and to whom local groups around the country know they can go. This, in my judgment, is OCD, especially when it has a man of Dr. Zigler's caliber as its Director.

Further, I will recommend that some of the funds which I would expect Congress will appropriate in the 1972 budget should be used to help the States in a sense put their own house in order as they relate to the White House Conference recommendations.

Many of the States have fine on-going Governors' committees that have done amazing things. But some have jerry-built operations that were just put together in order to choose delegates to a once a decade meeting.

I would propose that the National Council of State Committees on Children and Youth set up a subcommittee which would put together model legislation so that each State could have a permanent committee.

I am very pleased, for instance, to find that already since the White House Conference the State of New Jersey has done this and I know there is a great feeling in other States that this should happen, too. So on the local level we would have an on-going agency.

I think it would fill a real need if each year, rather than each decade, we had what amounted to a mini-White House Conference, that is perhaps a hundred or so of these leaders coming in to confer with Dr. Zigler on where we are in following up on these recommendations.

That would give greater currency so that when we came up to 1980 we would have a continuing body in being and a whole history of followup. The important thing to recall is that we are proposing for the next decade. We cannot expect instant results, but if this group would come to Washington perhaps at the time there is the annual meeting of the National Council of State Committees and review the recommendations at that date each year it would be extremely helpful.

Senator MONDALE. You referred to the Office of Child Development. Let me say that I share your admiration of Dr. Zigler. He is really one of the remarkable men in American government today. He has the respect of the leaders in the field and he is trusted to speak up for the sophisticated programs needed to deal with these needs of our children.

One of the matters that concerned the recent conference of the Society for Research on Child Development in Minneapolis, the national conference, was the fear that the forthcoming proposed re-

organization of the Office of Child Development would be relegated with much lower status than it now enjoys and that it would be stripped of its broad policy and innovative responsibilities.

It was the feeling of the conference that the Office of Child Development should be a central focus of the executive effort, that it should be elevated, strengthened, and of course given substantially increased resources.

Could you respond to that?

Mr. HESS. I certainly can't speak for Dr. Zigler, but I am sure he is going to be a witness here and shares my belief that there should be one focal point, that it should be high enough to have prestige and visability.

I think his Office should have a national child advocacy center within it. This is certainly one of the high recommendations of the White House Conference on Children. I think that would be the logical place to set up the unit that would be charged with seeing that there is a Federal response throughout the agencies to the recommendations of the White House Conference on Children. I think that Dr. Zigler shares these views.

We have had meetings on it and I am very hopeful that in the near future we will be able to create such a national child advocacy center.

Senator MONDALE. I believe the President said the Office of Child Development would be given the level which would permit direct access to the Secretary. It would be tragic if the same administration would diminish this role particularly after its own White House Conference proposed status for this office. It has become under Dr. Zigler's leadership the central pivot, it seems to me, of enlightened concern.

I am very hopeful that what you testify to this morning will become policy and that office can not only be elevated but, expanded under Dr. Zigler's leadership.

Senator Taft?

Senator TAFT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Hess, I have a number of questions here you may want to expand upon later. You made a specific recommendation with regard to funding this year and future funding—first, the $500 million figure and then the $250 million additional per year. Could you relate that in any way to the pending revenue sharing proposals?

Mr. HESS. I don't feel competent to do so at this time. I should state at the outset my role as I see it. I do not feel that I need support every recommendation of the White House Conference on Children nor the White House Conference on Youth. I do feel that I have a very strong commitment in making sure that the Nation and its institutions take these recommendations seriously and respond to them.

So I feel I am here, for example this morning, to put before you those recommendations, not as an advocate for them necessarily, but as a way of publicizing the work of a large body of very representative and often very important people.

There will be many other witnesses who also were intimately involved in the Conference, such as Dr. Bronfenbrenner, Dr. Kagan, Mrs. Lansburgh. Certainly they are advocates for a specific point of view as well as being great experts in the field, which I am not. They,

of course, will state, I am sure, their opinions of how realistic indeed these recommendations may be.

Senator TAFT. Mr. Hess, the "Profiles of Children" document distributed by the Conference indicates that more than 7 million children under the age of 14 of approximately 50 million are being raised in families in which the father is absent and that the proportion of children of Negro and other races living in such families is more than triple that of white children.

Isn't this in part an indication of the failure of the present welfare system as now structured and isn't this why we need relief for the working poor as proposed under the Family Assistance Act so that male-headed families will be able to remain intact and still receive benefits?

Mr. HESS. Personally, I would have to agree with you, but I could not speak for the Conference delegates. No. 3 priority of the Conference by weighted vote, that is giving 16 votes for first choice down to one vote for 16th choice, was the reordering of national priorities beginning with the guaranteed basic family income adequate for the needs of children.

When this was ranked by first votes alone this was the No. 1 priority of the Conference, so clearly welfare reform is very high up on the list of needs as seen by the delegates in the White House Conference on Children.

Senator TAFT. As I recall, there were also provisions for day care implementation in that proposal. Did the Conference come out with a specific recommendation in this?

Mr. HESS. The proposal on national priorities reads:

> We call for a reordering of priorities at all levels of American society so that children and families come first. At the national level we recommend that the proportion of our gross national product devoted to public expenditure for children and youth be increased by at least 50 per cent during the next decade and that the proportion of the Federal budget devoted to children be at least doubled during that period.
>
> We recommend that an annual income at the level necessary to meet the needs of children be guaranteed to every family in the nation. Support for families should be provided to the family as a unit without prejudice to various family structures and with recognition of differing cultural values and traditions.
>
> This call for a reordering of priorities is addressed to all levels of our society: government, business, industry, mass media, communities, schools, churches, neighborhoods and individual citizens.

(Information submitted for the record follows:)

Results of Balloting by the Delegates to the 1970 White House Conference on Children on Overriding Concerns and Specific Recommendations

Overriding Concerns

Following are the results of the December 18, 1970, balloting by the White House Conference on Children, as certified by the accounting firm of Alexander Grant & Company, Washington, D.C.

Votes were cast by 1,912 delegates, or 52% of those eligible. Several Forums chose not to vote, feeling that all of the recommendations should be considered of equal importance.

	Weighted Vote*	Ranked by No. of 1st Place Votes Only
Comprehensive family-oriented child development programs including health services, day care and early childhood education	1	3
The development of programs to eliminate the racism which cripples all children	2	2
Reordering of national priorities beginning with a guaranteed basic family income adequate for the needs of children	3	1
Improve nation's system of child justice so law responds in timely, positive ways to needs of children	4	11
A Federally financed national child health care program which assures comprehensive care for all children	5	6
A system of early identification of children with special needs and which delivers prompt and appropriate treatment	6	10
Establishment of a child advocacy agency financed by the Federal government and other sources with full ethnic, cultural, racial and sexual representation	7	8
Establish immediately a Cabinet post of children and youth to meet needs of all children	8	4
Health, welfare, education and bilingual-bicultural growth of all children must be given top priority	9	7
Immediate, massive funding for development of alternative optional forms of public education	10	9
A change in our national way of life to bring people back into the lives of children	11	5
Elimination of racism demands many meaningful Federal programs, particularly an adequate family income maintenance floor	12	12

*Under the weighted voting system, 1st place votes received 16 points, 2nd place votes 15 points, 3rd place 14 points and so on. Each concern's total points determined its rank in the balloting.

	Weighted Vote*	Ranked by No. of 1st Place Votes Only
A national land use policy must be developed to guarantee the quality of leisure services, social services and our nation's natural resources for all children	13	15
Universal developmental child care without sex role stereotyping will help to eliminate institutional, individual sexism	14	16
All institutions and programs that affect children must involve children as active participants in the decision-making process	15	13
The Indian representatives of this Conference will recommend that all levels embark on a vigorous practical approach to enhance the future of our children	16	14

* Under the weighted voting system, 1st place votes received 16 points, 2nd place votes 15 points, 3rd place 14 points and so on. Each concern's total points determined its rank in the listing.

Recommendations Specific Forum		Rating	No. of Votes
	Provide opportunities for every child to learn, grow, and live creatively by reordering national priorities	1	933
	Redesign education to achieve individualized, humanized, child-centered learning. We support proposed National Institute of Education with this goal	2	820
	Establishment of citizen community action groups to implement the multitude of excellent recommendations which have evolved out of this White House Conference on Children	3	771
	Reform justice system; emphasize prevention and protection; replace large institutions with small, homelike facilities	4	735
	Rights of children, including basic needs and education, require legal and other accountability of individuals and agencies responsible for providing them	5	618
	Establishment of a child advocacy agency financed by the Federal government and other sources with full ethnic, cultural, racial and sexual representation	6	602
	A Federally financed national child health care program which assures comprehensive care for all children	7	514
	To enhance the self-worth of all children, and to achieve early population stabilization, we recommend consumer-determined, publicly funded programs of (1) family life, sex and population education, and (2) voluntary family planning services and safe abortion available to all	8	482
	Resolved: The President immediately and unequivocally express his commitment to enforce existing legislation to end racism and discrimination	9	481
	The establishment of a Department of Education with Cabinet status, backed by a National Institute of Education	10	430
	Establish immediately a high-level, independent Office of Child Advocacy, with a network of local advocacy	11	427
	Department of Family and Children with Cabinet status: state and local councils, all adequately funded	12	406
425	Comprehensive developmental programs for handicapped or potentially handicapped children from birth to six be mandatory	13	382

	Rating	No. of Votes
The United States can and must drastically reduce injuries—perinatal, traffic, poisoning, burns, malnutrition, rats—and provide health and safety education	14	364
Quality developmental child care requires thoroughly trained personnel and parent and community control of programs	15	337
Federal support for independent research and dissemination of information on existing and alternate forms of education	16	316
Establish a people-oriented, National Institute for the Family for action, advocacy, implementation, legislation and research	17	299
A Federally financed national child health care program which assures comprehensive care for all children	18	293
The right-to-read effort be established as a top national priority supported by special legislation and funding commensurate with its critical importance	19	271
Promote expressions of identity through physical-emotional identity learning, parent education, and an international children's year	20	270
It is essential for a national body to be formed to assure the implementation of the recommendations of the 1970 Children's Conference	21	259
That these words be included in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag: ". . . stands; *and dedicate my self to the task of making it one nation, . . .*"	22	196
That cross-cultural, participating experiences must be provided for *all* children so they may understand the concepts and goals of justice in terms of human relations; and that community decision-making processes and educational experiences must provide for the participation and knowledge necessary for a personal, realistic commitment to the democratic system	23	152
Establish a national task force to develop an Office of Leisure Services at Federal and state levels	24	120
In an effort to begin the process of improving the quality of life for children (some of whom we can each call by name) the members of Forum 20 (Child Development		

67-582 O - 71 - 2

	Rating	No. of Votes
and Mass Media) are making such recommendations as to affect and implement many concerns regarding humane human development and the mass media. We are unwilling to suggest the relative dispensibility of any one of our recommendations. They are all urgent and affordable	25	89

427

1970 White House Conference on Children Back-up Statements of Major Recommendations

These are back-up statements of the major recommendations submitted by the clusters, forums and independent caucuses. The statements are in two parts. The first presents overriding concerns identified by forum clusters and independent caucuses. The second part covers the top recommendation of each of the forums. The order of the statements was randomly selected and corresponds to the order of recommendations on the official ballot.

Overriding Concerns

Comprehensive Family Oriented Child Development Programs Including Health Services, Day Care and Early Childhood Education

We recommend that the Federal Government fund comprehensive child care programs, which will be family centered, locally controlled, and universally available, with initial priority to those whose needs are greatest. These programs should provide for active participation of family members in the development and implementation of the program. These programs—including health, early childhood education, and social services—should have sufficient variety to insure that families can select the options most appropriate to their needs. A major educational program should also be provided to inform the public about the elements essential for quality in child care services, about the inadequacies of custodial care, and the nature of the importance of child care services as a supplement, not a substitute, for the family as the primary agent for the child's development as a human being.

Federal funding must be available immediately for the first year for spaces for 500,000 children, increasing 250,000 spaces per year until it reaches all families who seek it and all children who need it.

The Development of Program to Eliminate the Racism Which Cripples All Children

Much has been written and said about racism in our country yet this crippling process permeates all elements of our society. Unlike racial segregation which can be at least partially dealt with by direct government intervention, racism is far from being uprooted from the hearts of the American people. It is a social disease that most of us carry. The tragedy is that we are unaware of our subconscious feelings of superiority and inferiority.

To rid this nation of racism we must bring to the attention of our people the gravity and scope of this disease, explaining how it is manifested and how it is dangerously vitiating the strength of our nation and dividing it against itself.

We must set up the mechanism of education to assist people to become aware of their racism and to begin to rid themselves of it.

Conquering racism is America's most challenging issue. It requires immediate attention by all levels of government. It requires serious self-examination by every American. If we continue to ignore this problem, the nation itself is in jeopardy.

Reordering of National Priorities Beginning with a Guaranteed Basic Family Income Adequate for the Needs of Children

We call for a reordering of priorities at all levels of American society so that children and families come first. At the national level we recommend that the proportion of our gross national product devoted to public expenditure for children and youth be increased by at least 50 percent during the next decade, and that the proportion of the Federal budget devoted to children be at least doubled during that period. We recommend that an annual income at the level necessary to meet the needs of children be guaranteed to every family in the Nation. Support for families should be provided to the family as a *unit* without prejudice against variant family structures and with recognition of differing cultural values and traditions. This call for a reordering of

priorities is addressed to all levels of our society: government, business, industry, mass media, communities, schools, churches, neighborhoods and individual citizens.

Improve Nation's System of Child Justice so Law Responds in Timely, Positive Ways to Needs of Children

In a time of soaring child neglect, abuse and delinquency, the White House Conference believes that concerned citizens everywhere must reappraise the entire child justice system. Deficiencies of the system contribute to this alarming increase.

Not only do we need more and better trained judges and staff, but community resources must be available. We need a complete restructuring of child and juvenile laws; laws which emphasize not guilt or innocence, but which seek out and treat with compassion those who come to the law's attention.

Law must be restructured to aid and guide; to humanize, not stigmatize; law must strengthen and improve the quality of family life.

We need a massive plan for small community-based care facilities, foster homes, group homes, and day care. When children must be involuntarily confined let it be only after full due process and legal safeguards and let it be to home-like institutions staffed with competent, concerned persons dedicated to care and not to storage and punishment.

A Federally Financed National Child Health Care Program Which Assures Comprehensive Care for All Children

We believe that this country is moving toward a more formalized national health program. It seems feasible that implementation be in stages, and we urge that children be given first priority. We, therefore, recommend that, as a first step, a federally financed comprehensive child health care program be established. This program will require a stable, permanent, federal financing mechanism, possibly through a combination of payroll taxes and general tax revenues. Reimbursement procedures, including prepayment, must be designed to create incentives for more rational, organized, and efficient systems of health care delivery which stress illness prevention and health promotion. We also believe that this program and all federal programs providing health care services to children should allocate a specific percentage of their budgets to help finance new resources in areas of critical need.

A System of Early Identification of Children with Special Needs and which Delivers Prompt and Appropriate Treatment

Children cry out for help, but are seldom heard. Least able of all are those with special needs: the retarded; the physically and mentally handicapped; those whose environment produces abuse, neglect and directs the child to anti-social conduct. Even the intellectually gifted child has special needs: he does not fit into the conventional mold.

We call on the communities to find new ways to identify and reach these children. We urge the schools, the health and welfare agencies to better serve these children—by parent and community education, by improved case-finding methods.

We recognize that in many communities sources of case referrals are painfully inadequate. We know even when programs are available, agencies are too often unresponsive.

We urge each community to reexamine its social conscience, to ask if it is doing all it can for these children. Let us not, for lack of concern, allow such children to become the social and physical misfits of tomorrow. Let each community, with generous aid from State and Federal funds, make available effective care for children with special needs.

Establishment of a Child Advocacy Agency Financed by the Federal Government and Other Sources With Full Ethnic, Cultural, Racial and Sexual Representation	This Agency will be charged with the fostering, the coordination, and the implementation of all programs related to the development of childhood identity. To foster this development the Agency will be especially concerned with programs which strengthen family life in any form it occurs. These programs will involve 1) education for parenting, which emphasizes the recognition of the uniqueness of every child, 2) the establishment of a National Commission to strengthen and enhance cultural pluralism, and 3) the development of community based comprehensive resource center for families.
Establish Immediately a Cabinet Post of Children and Youth To Meet Needs of All Children	We strongly recommend that the President and Congress immediately establish a Department of Children and Youth at cabinet level, responsible directly to the President of the United States. This department, with heavy youth involvement at policy level, would encompass all Federal agencies and institutions dealing with children and youth; would present and protect the needs and rights of children and youth; and would set standards and monitor all Federal, state, and local programs serving the needs of children. This department is needed because children have not received the attention due them in our society under the existing fragmented organizational structure. We concur with the President that with one-fourth of our population under the age of 14, it is only right that this segment receive proper recognition. The Concerned Kids Caucus
Health, Welfare, Education and Bilingual-bicultural Growth of ALL Children Must be Given Top Priority	The future of our children and their families has grown bleak and full of despair. When the richest nation on earth has a government that, with a clear conscience, can deafen its ears to the poverty-filled cries of ten million poor children, then America has lost its soul indeed. We who represent the Spanish-speaking-Spanish-surnamed minority groups are adamently united in that those injustices forced on us will be exposed and rectified. We will unite our resources to change an administration that can light a Christmas tree on the White House lawn on the same day that a manpower development bill (S.3867) is vetoed, thus putting out the Christmas lights of hope for ten million poor children. *Merry Christmas White House in the Name of Our Children.* Spanish-Speaking, Spanish-Surname Caucus
Immediate, Massive Funding for Development of Alternative Optional Forms of Public Education	Education has long been locked into a monolithic structure that has frustrated most fundamental efforts for change. We need to develop a wide range of new options and new programs within and parallel to the present system of public education. We need funds—massive funds—to develop and implement a variety of alternatives, but there are many alternatives that require little or no additional funds. Legislative exemptions from regulation and the imagination to free ourselves from the binding constraints of unexamined tradition can in themselves be combined to produce significant changes. We seek the right to be wrong, to make mistakes in our quest for better education. Such experimental programs must be *optional* —not required. Experimental programs should be evaluated and held to the same criteria of evaluation as existing programs.

Evidence should be applied equally in seeking change or seeking not to change. Provision must be made to protect the interests of everyone concerned and to guarantee that the development of alternatives not be an unwitting support of bigotry or segregation.

A Change in Our National Way of Life to Bring People Back Into the Lives of Children

We must change our national way of life so that children are no longer isolated from the rest of society. We call upon all our institutions—public and private—to initiate and expand programs that will bring adults back into the lives of children and children back into the lives of adults. This means the reinvolvement of children of all ages with parents and other adults in common activities and responsibilities. It means parent-child centers as opposed to child development centers. It means breaking down the wall between school and community. It means new flexibility for schools, business and industries so that children and adults can spend time together and become acquainted with each other's worlds at work and at play. It means family-directed community planning, services and recreation programs. It means the reinvolvement of children and adults in each other's lives.

Elimination of Racism Demands Many Meaningful Federal Programs, Particularly an Adequate Family Income Maintenance Floor

Racism, individual, institutional, and collective, that permeates American society has resulted in psychological and physical damage to its children—Black, brown, red, yellow, and white.

This racism has created an environment which hinders the learning capacity of all children, even those with special family resources.

Similarly, this racism has made it impossible for children to obtain the health services vital to their survival, growth, and development.

Removal of external handicaps to the family and support of internal strengths through Federally sponsored and financed programs acceptable to and designed by these families is of the highest priority.

Programs that deal with discrimination in employment and lack of access to financial resources should take priority over currently popularized programs.

The greatest injustice to children can be found in the failure to provide wholesome physical environments and services.

A positive vote for this resolution by White House Conference on Children delegates is vital to all children.

Black Caucus

A National Land Use Policy Must Be Developed To Guarantee The Quality of Leisure Services, Social Services and Our Nation's Natural Resources for All Children

A national land use policy must encompass the *Social* as well as the *Physical* environment of children. A national land use policy must address itself to cities as well as to open spaces. A national land use policy must assure space set aside for recreation and leisure activities, for adequate housing, for public transportation systems, for sidewalks and bicycle paths, for learning stations (such as museums, libraries), and must address itself to pollution of air and water as well as to noise pollution.

The quality of life for a child is affected by the quality of the physical and social environment which must provide him or her with a broad variety of educational and leisure experiences.

431

Universal Developmental Child Care Without Sex Role Stereotyping Will Help to Eliminate Institutional, Individual Sexism

We demand:

A commitment to a network of quality child care developmental services for all children whose families seek them;

complete separation of all child welfare development services from public assistance programs;

condemnation of sexism—the belief that women and men must play separate sex-linked roles with women in a subordinated position;

censure of the White House Conference itself for demonstrating sexism through the domination of decision-making processes by men and execution of details by women;

flexible and/or shorter work week hours for women and men, to provide wider opportunities outside the home for women and more child care and home life for men;

For women, as for men, for girls as for boys, anatomy should be a part not the whole of one's identity and destiny. We urge unanimous adoption of this resolution.

Women's Caucus

All Institutions and Programs That Affect Children Must Involve Children as Active Participants in the Decision-making Process

Children are powerless people. Like other minority groups they are denied the basic right to participate in the decisions that govern their lives. Their dignity is smothered, needs go undetected, fresh ideas are lost, programs are mis-directed, and their decision-making capacities go undeveloped.

Perhaps there is no one quality more important for the developing self than a feeling of involvement in what is taking place. The lack of consultation and involvement is the cause of the continuing war between children and society. When the child is a part of something, then he becomes responsible.

If, for example, children, not just youth, had been included in the White House Conference as both delegates and planners, we might have come into sharper focus on their needs and at the same time have made an affirmative statement of their worth.

The Indian Representatives of this Conference Will Recommend That All Levels Embark on a Vigorous Practical Approach to Enhance the Future of our Children

American Indians are a unique people within American society, guaranteed by treaties, congressional laws and individual actions of United States Presidents. Violations of this relationship have been numerous because neither Congress nor the various United States Presidents have been active in carrying out the provisions of these guarantees. President Nixon has declared that certain innovations conducive to self-determination will be implemented by his administration.

The American Indian Caucus of the White House Conference on Children declares that the President should follow through with his stated INDIAN policy of self-determination for American Indians without termination of government responsibilities with INDIAN tribes.

The American Indian takes pride in his land and desires to protect its physical and cultural environment from any outside exploitation.

American Indian Caucus,

Specific Forum Recommendations	
Provide Opportunities for Every Child to Learn, Grow, and Live Creatively by Reordering National Priorities	The creative child whom we wish to nurture is curious, wonders and questions; seeks new experiences; is open to the world; independent and free from social and group pressures to conform at the cost of individuality; willing to risk error; play with ideas and experiment; willing to change and live with change. Such a child is in the heart of every child but presently our schools and communities are not providing the atmosphere and resources for the development of such creative persons. In response, we must foster in each community the development of total educational programs available to every child through a more diverse and flexible educational system, more creative approaches to learning. a stress on early childhood education, the expansion of cultural and creative learning centers, and the integration of aesthetic education in every school, institution and agency which serves children. Forum 6
Redesign Education to Achieve Individualized, Humanized, Child-centered Learning. We Support Proposed National Institute of Education with this Goal	A major redesign of education is urgent. Educational technology, defined as a logical process of learning design, can help achieve this goal. An overriding goal of redesign should be development of an educational system responding to the needs of individual learners through personalized evaluation, individualized learning, and the thorough preparation of all persons involved in their education. We specifically urge that legislation authorizing N.I.E. provide for applied research and development efforts in educational technology within the Institute and that educational technology be defined in this legislation as described in our report. A process which: A. Identifies needs of learners, individually and collectively B. Determines what must be done to meet those needs and considers alternative solutions and options C. Involves individual learner in selecting the best way to meet his needs D. Designs and implements the selected strategies and tools E. Evaluates their effectiveness F. Revises when necessary Forum 9
Establishment of Citizen Community Action Groups to Implement the Multitude of Excellent Recommendations Which Have Evolved Out of this White House Conference on Children 433	The White House Conference process is one of proposing and influencing the passage of legislation that will enhance the physical and social environment of children. While acknowledging the success of this process, it is our conclusion that no legislation, however commendable, can be a valuable instrument of social change unless a structure exists that extends the legislative process to a point that guarantees its provisions are implemented at the lowest level of society. Existing processes are not accomplishing this task adequately.

Therefore, it is urgent that procedures be created which guarantee that our efforts here become a tangible reality to children, and that our words become effective processes.

Young Americans, striving to accept the responsibilities of citizenship find few positions of responsibility open to them. It is our sense and that of many delegates at this conference, that a new thrust is imperative. We submit that the process described herein is one workable answer to this need: a mobilizing force at the grass roots level which is composed either of youth or of youth and concerned adults that will work for the CHILDREN—NOW!

Contemporary history indicates that the recent impact of youth upon our society has been one of conscience and sober responsibility.

Therefore, let it be resolved that: (A) A need exists for the construction of a power base that will serve as a booster to the existing concerns of our present youth and how they relate to our CHILDREN—NOW; and for those currently in power at the local, state, and federal levels to have an honest approach to change.

(B) Delegates to this conference be made to feel the necessity to continue the White House Conference process by committing themselves to activities of organization, mobilization, and sensitivity within their communities.

(C) That we cause to exist a body of people composed of two members of each of the forums of this conference.

(D) At least one of these must be a youth.

(E) Geographic, economic, and ethnic factors must be taken in to consideration for selection.

(F) That this body be completely autonomous in nature. (G) That neither sanction, endorsement, or funding for this body be accepted if it in any way endangers its autonomy.

We suggest five options of initiating procedures at the community level:

(a) a working rapport with the White House Conference process.

(b) utilization of existing youth organs.

(c) university-based urban studies coalition groups.

(d) National Community Programs, INC.

(e) Community Self Starters.

We strongly feel that best potential for the new thrust is offered by the Self Starter method, but this requires a moral encouragement from a non-managerial existing body, and a cogent liaison with the delegates of this Conference.

It is imperative that there be a strong interaction with existing community organizations, responsible and effective.

These ideas apply not only in implementation of ideas to better the child's physical and social environment, but also in developing suggestions made by other forums in this Conference.

Reform Justice System; Emphasize Prevention and Protection; Replace Large Institutions with Small, Homelike Facilities	Children in trouble are crying for HELP! Prevention of abuse, neglect, and delinquency should be the top priority of this nation, and should be stressed by all citizens, officials, agencies and institutions. We believe the Federal government must assist state and local units of governments financially and in other ways in improving the juvenile justice system. All children in trouble and in need should be diverted from the justice system unless court proceedings are necessary to protect the child. No child under the age of 16 should be placed in a jail or penal institution. No child under 14 should be committed to a training school. Instead we recommend that small, home-like treatment-oriented facilities such as shelter homes, foster homes, youth homes, group homes, and half-way houses be developed and financed by federal, state, local and private funds, and be staffed with trained, concerned personnel. Forum 23
Rights of Children, Including Basic Needs and Education, Require Legal and Other Accountability of Individuals and Agencies Responsible for Providing Them	The following is an explanation of the above. Every child is entitled to good health and care from conception, and to at least minimum standards of food, shelter and clothing, and to effective education, in an environment of economic security. Individuals, agencies and public bodies offering these services to children have seldom been held legally accountable for ensuring competent performance. Therefore we recommend that methods of redress be established to hold accountable those who render services to children to a standard of care commensurate with the skill their profession requires, and to hold accountable those private and public bodies which fail to render adequate services to children. Forum 22
Establishment of a Child Advocacy Agency Financed by the Federal Government and Other Sources With Full Ethnic, Cultural, Racial and Sexual Representation	This Agency will be charged with the fostering, the coordination, and the implementation of all programs related to the development of childhood identity. To foster this development the Agency will be especially concerned with programs which strengthen family life in any form it occurs. These programs will involve 1) Education for parenting, which emphasizes the uniqueness of every child, 2) the establishment of a National Commission to strengthen and enhance cultural pluralism, 3) the development of community based comprehensive resource center for families. Forum 2
A Federally Financed National Child Health Care Program Which Assures Comprehensive Care for All Children	We believe that this country is moving toward a more formalized national health program. It seems feasible that implementation be in stages, and we urge that children be given first priority. We, program will require a stable, permanent, Federal financing comprehensive child health care program be established. This program will require a stable, permanent, federal financing mechanism, possible through a combination of payroll taxes and general tax revenues. Reimbursement procedures, including prepayment, must be designed to create incentives for more rational, organized, and efficient systems of health care delivery which stress illness prevention and health promotion. We also believe that this program and all Federal programs providing health care services to children should allocate a specific percentage of their budgets to help finance new resources in areas of critical need. 435 Forum 10

	Votes	Rank
* *Comprehensive Child Health Program*		
A federally financed National Child Health care Program which assumes comprehensive care for children (17th item on list—by Forum 10)	540°	7
Identical recommendation (19th item on list—by Forum 11)	293	18
Combined gross total	833	5
Net total (less estimated overlapping vote of 17% of latter item or 50 votes	783	5 "

Corrected total as tabulated by Alexander Grant & Co., but erroneously reported on Press Release of Dec. 22, 1970, as 514.

To Enhance the Self-worth of All Children, and to Achieve Early Population Stabilization, We Recommend Consumer-determined, Publicly Funded Programs of (1) Family Life, Sex and Population Education, and (2) Voluntary Family Planning Services and Safe Abortion Available to All

It is the right of every child to know about his own sexuality and identity without the legal restrictions now imposed upon distribution of information and services to minors. Family life and sex education should be a multi-faceted approach including community involvement, information on methods of planning families, and emphasis on the uniqueness of each individual within his own family.

Family planning services are defined as services to all family members, including the education, comprehensive medical and social services necessary to permit individuals freely to determine and achieve the number and spacing of their children. Family planning services include contraception, sterilization, and abortion. The full range of services should be available to all, regardless of sex, age, marital status, economic group or ethnic origin; and should be administered in a noncoercive and nondiscriminatory manner.

We recommend a national program to educate all citizens in the problems of population growth, and to develop programs to achieve population stability. Population growth in the United States occurs primarily among affluent and middle class whites, and programs designed to achieve population stabilization should be directed to reducing their natality.

Forum 16

Resolved: The President Immediately and Unequivocally Expresses His Commitment to Enforce Existing Legislation to End Racism and Discrimination

The President should make the elimination of racism and all discrimination against minorities the No. 1 priority of this administration. We insist he address his moral authority as President to this issue in his State of the Union Address.

There is flagrant disrespect of law and order in this country when it comes to the rights of minority groups. Existing laws, treaties, and court decisions are not enforced, e.g., various Indian-American Treaties, the 1843 Guadalupe-Hidalgo Treaty. We are also concerned about the continuation of the concentration camp laws. We insist the President use his authority to enforce this legislation and these decisions.

Incisive reports have been made laying bare the present destructive results of racism and the incipient dangers. We urge that these reports—National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, U.S. Civil Rights Commission, Committee on Minority Group Children of the Joint Commission on the Mental Health of Children—be given the widest possible dissemination. We urge that their judicious recommendations, which might save our nation, be immediately implemented.

436

Forum 18

The Establishment of a Department of Education with Cabinet Status, Backed by a National Institute of Education

to establish national education policies and to promote constructive change in present educational practices, with the over-riding purpose of developing each individual's potential to the fullest, and improving our society.

This requires substantial increases in Federal appropriations to achieve the following:

salvaging the growing number of school districts now on the verge of collapse.

providing massive implementation of what we know is good quality education as well as further experimentation through a wide variety of educational institutions, but insisting on public accountability.
We make this recommendation in light of our conviction that school is a concept, not a place, and that schooling and education are not synonymous.

Forum 5

Establish Immediately a High Level, Independent Office of Child Advocacy, with a Network of Local Advocacy

Forum 24 passed the following recommendations:

A. That the cost of the Child Advocacy program be paid from Federal tax monies, with provision for use of other supplemental funds, without the requirement for matching funds.

B. States, local communities and neighborhoods can develop their own programs. States which do not develop comprehensive plans and hence do not develop state councils would not receive Federal funds for state programs. The Federal law should provide that direct local or neighborhood grants for local planning could be made where no state council was developed or the National Child Advocacy office determines the state plan insufficient. Such direct local or neighborhood grants will not be subject to veto by state officials.

C. Local councils shall be so structured as to maintain effective citizen control while providing for active participation of community agencies and organizations concerned with the child.

Department of Family and Children With Cabinet Status: State and Local Councils, All Adequately Funded

Acknowledging that the family is society's primary unit for developing human potential and transmitting cultural heritage, we charge parents and children with enhancing their ability and responsibility to strengthen their own family life; furthermore

We recommend that a Department of the Family and Children with the status of a cabinet post and councils and commissions on state and local levels be established, adequately funded, and charged with the responsibility for:

coordinating services to families and children;

reconstructing old programs;

developing new programs; and performing other functions, such as:

convening a White House Conference on Families and Children at least every five years with ongoing activities in states and local communities with children participating at all levels;

supporting policies which provide for part-time employment without discrimination for parents who wish to spend more time with their children; and

437

assuring the right of all children to have legally responsible, permanent parents.

In the interim, we strongly urge increased support for the Office of Child Development.

Forum 15

Comprehensive Developmental Programs for Handicapped or Potentially Handicapped Children From Birth to Six be Mandatory

We affirm that complete comprehensive child health care should be recognized as a top priority for all children in the Nation. The child with handicapping conditions has often been denied his right to health care because of the difficulties in meeting his special needs. This recommendation will allow handicapped children to achieve the fulfillment of their potentials which is the right of all children.

Recommendation—

Inclusive within comprehensive health needs, diagnostic, treatment, and educational services be provided handicapped children without arbitrary barriers.

There are many programs for which legislation and authorization have been completed. We feel that full appropriation of all such legislation is an important first step in improving and expanding the potential of handicapped children. An example of such legislation is the recently enacted Developmental Disabilities Act (Public Law 91–517). Cognizant of the failure to appropriate authorized funds, we recommend the full appropriation of authorized funds for programs dealing with handicapping conditions, especially in those programs which focus on manpower training, the provision of services, and research.

Forum 12

The United States Can and Must Drastically Reduce Injuries—Perinatal, Traffic, Poisoning, Burns, Malnutrition, Rats and Provide Health and Safety Education

The top priority for this nation's development and utilization of its resources must be its children because:

1. They form the essential element of human, social, and economic propagation;

2. The majority of this country has a vested interest in the well-being of its children;

3. Individually or collectively, they are unable to provide their own supportive political forces and power;

4. They are constantly changing but they continue to represent an essential element of our nation's present and future; and

5. They become, or are already, a truly disadvantaged population without appropriate support.

With these tenents as a framework, the concept of children's injuries has been incorrectly defined, and consequently decisions relating to children's injuries have reflected a restricted perspective. Childhood injury encompasses interdependent physical, psychological, social and environmental factors.

438

Forum 13

Quality Developmental Child Care Requires Thoroughly Trained Personnel and Parent and Community Control of Programs

The two most important factors in insuring quality in developmental child care are adequate training of the personnel who work with the children and the responsiveness of the programs through parent and community control.

A massive increase in training efforts is essential to meet the goal of universal availability of developmental child care. Adequate funding to provide training for at least 50,000 additional child care workers must be added annually over the next decade. Training should be directed toward trainers, professional, preprofessional, and volunteer staff who work directly with children, administrative and ancillary staff of child care programs, parents, and youth. A complete program should include training for parenthood in the public schools, started before the Junior High School level, and with opportunities for direct experience in day care centers. The training should include both male and female students.

True responsiveness of programs to insure quality can only be established by requiring control in individual programs by parents of the enrolled children. Parents and local communities must also control 1) local distribution of funds, 2) community planning and coordination, and 3) monitoring and licensing functions.

Forum 17

Federal Support For Independent Research and Dissemination of Information on Existing and Alternate Forms of Education

To encourage and support independent research relating to the development of those evaluative systems and processes designed to measure those aspects of human development which are not generally considered in the present system of public education.

To encourage and support independent investigations and critical evaluations of educational programs, motives, goals, systems, and practices currently in use, and/or suggested as experimental models for future use. Such a commission would consider for support studies and experiments designed to explore, for example, the extent and the validity of the alleged myths and misconceptions governing our educational culture.

A national "information-on-educational alternatives" body which, using television, films, and other media, bring to parents, teachers, students, and communities, a more extensive understanding of the wealth of educational alternatives now available in the United States and elsewhere. (The body will be not only a central source of information, but an active dispenser or new information.)

Forum 8

Establish a People-oriented, National Institute for the Family for Action, Advocacy, Implementation, Legislation and Research

Recognizing that the family is the dominant socializing agent and the primary interface between the individual and society, its central position must be considered by the White House Conference on Children in making recommendations for improving the well being of our Nation's children.

It is vital that children living in all types of family structures, e.g. single parent, traditional, dual work, commune, etc., have equally available options for self fulfillment.

Present human service systems tend to fragment and undermine the family. All such delivery systems should be redirected to provide services and support *through* and *to* the family as a *unit* with recognition of the different needs, strengths and weaknesses

of varying family forms. Therefore, we recommend that an Institute for the Family be established by the Congress as a quasi-public organization. The process for its operation should be assured by establishing a trust fund through a per capita assessment drawn from Federal taxes.

This Institute should have a broadly representative Board of Directors and be adequately staffed for carrying out its functions. These functions are:

1) Serve as an advocate for families and children;

2) Provide the mechanisms for assuring follow-up and implementation of the White House Conference recommendations at all levels;

3) Develop and support demonstration, action, research and evaluation programs which focus on building new environments for families and children; reorder existing services and programs to fit around desires and aspirations of families, and to involve families in their development and implementation;

4) Examine existing legislation for its effects on variant family forms;

5) Take action against legislation, regulations and practices which are punitive to children because of their discriminatory policies against the integrity of families or variant forms of parenting; and

6) Technical assistance to state and local programs for families and children.

Forum 14

A Federally Financed National Child Health Care Program Which Assures Comprehensive Care for All Children

We believe that this country is moving toward a more formalized national health program. It seems feasible that implementation be in stages, and we urge that children be given first priority. We, therefore, recommend that as a first step, a federally financed comprehensive child health care program be established. This program will require a stable, permanent, federal financing mechanism, possible through a combination of payroll taxes and general tax revenues. Reimbursement procedures, including prepayment, must be designed to create incentives for more rational, organized, and efficient systems of health care delivery which stress illness prevention and health promotion. We also believe that this program and all Federal programs providing health care services to children should allocate a specific percentage of their budgets to help finance new resources in areas of critical need.

Forum 11

The Right to Read Effort Be Established As a Top National Priority Supported by Special Legislation and Funding Commensurate With Its Critical Importance

The single overriding goal of this recommendation is national literacy. For generations we have accepted as a fact that literacy is imperative to the survival of a democracy. As an ideal, nothing less than universal school attendance in the United States, we are decidedly short of universal literacy. The Right to Read Effort (launched in September of 1969) has made a beginning toward improvement. However, obstacles still remain. The effort needs to be strengthened, coordinated, and specifically funded on a scale commensurate with the job to be done. The goal requires national awareness of the problem; national coordination of research;

rapid improvement in teacher education; development of effective instructional materials; integration of school experiences with home and community resources; and adoption of modern management procedures within the education sector.

Forum 7

Promote Expressions of Identity Through Physical-emotional Identity Learning, Parent Education, and an International Children's Year

Whereas in our present society, complicated by cultures within cultures, many children experience insecurity, fear, and prejudice; and

Whereas a positive self-concept and a satisfactory realization of role are vital in a rapidly changing society;

We Propose to Federal, state, and local governments:

That programs be funded to encourage high priority for the affective learnings (those dealing with feelings and imagination) balancing the current emphasis on cognitive learnings (those dealing with factual knowledge); provide resources such as a cultural bank; and provide necessary teacher re-training.

That funding be provided for programs of Parent Education which offer new options in child rearing, conflict-resolution, and self-identity growth.

We propose to the United States Government and to the United Nations that these and other recommendations of the White House Conference on Children be promoted and celebrated through an International Children's Year comparable to the International Geophysical Year with a possible target date of 1975.

It Is Essential for a National Body To Be Formed to Assure the Implementation of the Recommendations of the 1970 Children's Conference.

Recommendation No. 21 does not have a back-up statement.

Forum 3

That These Words be Included in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag:

". . . stands; *and dedicate myself to the task of making it* one nation, . . ."

Our primary concern is that all Americans, concerned with the future of our children, join in faith and work to make the values expressed in our pledge of allegiance to the flag, a living fact in American life.

Under the administration of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Congress revised the pledge to the flag to include the phrase "under God." We recommend that it be further revised to read "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands; *and dedicate myself to the task of making it* one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

This would provide Americans of all ages, races and cultures with a realistic, affirmative pledge to deepen our common commitment to a truly free, truly responsible and truly united society.

411 Forum 1

Recommendations of Forum 25

Whereas we recognized that the American home, school, and community are failing to provide the examples, experiences, and knowledge that will teach *all* children about democratic values and processes, FORUM 25 recommends:

That cross-cultural, participating experiences must be provided for *all* children so they may understand the concepts and goals of justice in terms of human relations;

And that community decision-making processes and educational experiences must provide for the participation and knowledge necessary for a personal, realistic commitment to the democratic system.

Establish a National Task Force to Develop an Office of Leisure Services at Federal and State Levels

This office shall have as its objectives and responsibilities promotion or administration of:

a. Education in the knowledge, attitudes, and skills for creative participation in leisure activities.

b. Coordination of resources and services relevant to leisure at all levels of organization, public and private.

c. The use of all educational media for the purpose of education in leisure.

d. Ensuring that availability of resources be equal for all, having in mind minority groups, socioeconomic level, and geographic lo-

e. Leisure resources and activities should be used to strengthen rather than fragment family life.

f. Involvement of children and youth at the community level in decision-making regarding use of leisure resources.

g. Education in the importance of the total physical environment. cation.

h. Standards for personnel, services, and facilities.

i. Long-term research and development relevant to leisure and its role in survival and enrichment of human life.

j. Ensuring that leisure resources are included in all public and private land and urban developments.

The President and the respective governors should immediately appoint task forces representative of children, minority groups, and the broad areas of leisure activities to develop plans for the implementation and operation of the offices and to serve as ongoing advisory groups.

Forum 21

In an effort to begin the process of improving the quality of life for children (some of whom we can each call by name) the members of Forum 20 (Child Development and Mass Media) are making such recommendations as to affect and implement many concerns regarding humane human development and the mass media. We are unwilling to suggest the relative dispensibility of any one of our recomendations. They are all urgent and affordable

442

(Forum 20)

67-582 O - 71 - 3

Senator TAFT. Thank you. As a member of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, I am also interested in the question of early childhood nutrition. Were there any findings in that regard either with respect to the incidences of inadequate diets generally or especially among children in low-income families?

Mr. HESS. It was the general feeling in the planning sessions we had with various groups, State committees, and individuals that there had just been a White House Conference that went into the questions of hunger, malnutrition, diet, and so forth in great detail, that there was to be a followup meeting shortly after ours in February and that we therefore should not have a specific forum on this but rather we chose to put experts in this field interspersed in all of the forums so that it would be a theme that spread throughout the conference, as it did.

But I would not say that specifically new material above and beyond that developed by the White House Conference on Food and Health and Nutrition was developed.

Senator TAFT. Thank you. In a statement in the "Profiles of Children" report it is indicated that while all 50 States have child abuse laws with reporting requirements and all public welfare agencies are required by law to provide protective services for children, no statistics are available on the extent of service provided.

Is the administration contemplating any steps to increase the availability of such information, either through legislative authorization or otherwise?

Mr. HESS. I have no knowledge on that. But I certainly shall check it out and respond to the committee.

Senator TAFT. As you know, among each major age grouping of children, the 26 million under 6 years old and 33 million 6 through 13 years of age there are a substantial number of low-income children, estimated I think at 3 and 6 million respectively.

Does the administration in terms of funding and program emphasis continue to regard these low-income children of the highest priority as compared with other children?

Mr. HESS. Certainly it was the sense of the White House Conference on Children that they should be. And to the degree to which the agencies of the Federal Executive will now start a department-by-department review of these findings I am sure that they will have to respond to that question specifically.

Senator TAFT. Can child development programs be used as a method of overcoming racial isolation that we witness at older ages and society generally?

Mr. HESS. Having listened for several months to my eloquent colleague, Urie Bronfenbrenner, whom I am sure will direct himself to this question, I would say it is not just racial isolation but it is age isolation as well and that many creative thoughts came out of this Conference on the use of developmental day care that involves the use of older children with younger children, the involvement of parents in the whole process, and, of course, equally important, the blend of all racial groups.

Senator TAFT. Did the Conference focus to any extent on the special problem of children who come from homes where a language other

than English is spoken, for example, Puerto Rican children in Lorain and New York, and Mexican-American children throughout the Southwest, and, if so, what recommendations were made to deal with these special problems?

Mr. HESS. First, I might say that of all of the caucuses that have recommendations on the ballot, the one of the Spanish-surname, Spanish-speaking caucus which recommended the increase in the bicultural education rated highest on the ballot.

Furthermore, the forum on children without prejudice gave some very specific recommendations as to bicultural and bilingual education. I will have to find that one for you. But it related, I think, specifically to the use of teaching in two languages when, I believe, 10 percent of the population in that school spoke other than English as a first language.

Senator MONDALE. Would you include that recommendation for the record?

Mr. HESS. Yes; I shall. Forum 18 recommended "that wherever 10 percent of the children of a given school are fluent in a language other than English, as in certain Spanish-speaking communities, the school curriculum in all grades should be offered in the minority language as well as in English. The minority language should also be designated an official language in such communities."

Senator TAFT. Mr. Hess, was any consideration given as to what Federal agency or department really primarily ought to take on this responsibility? Are some of these recommendations ones that could be better implemented by agencies other than HEW, OEO, for instance, or what particular breakdown do you have in mind?

Mr. HESS. I can only say that beyond the very strong support which the Office of Child Development received not only at the White House Conference on Children, but at the followup regional conferences, there was a strong feeling to establish a Cabinet post for Children and Youth. This was the eighth in our weighted ballot and there also was a recommendation to establish a Cabinet office for Education and this was 10th among the specific forum recommendations.

Senator TAFT. So you don't know, really?

Mr. HESS. I don't know. After all, we all recognize that this White House Conference, as all White House Conferences, is composed of a group of people who are particularly concerned and who are indeed special pleaders and we as special pleaders asked for the most immediate and highest identification of the problem with which we are concerned.

Indeed, as we recommend a Cabinet post for Children and Youth, I dare say that the White House Conference on Aging may do the same.

Senator TAFT. Thank you very much. Those are all the questions I have at this time.

Senator MONDALE. Mr. Hess, you make reference in your testimony to the No. 1 recommendation, based on the weighted votes, which is developmental child care programs emphasizing comprehensiveness, the family-centered nature of the effort and quality.

Would it be fair to say that the Conference very clearly preferred this course to custodial day care kinds of treatment of preschool children?

Mr. HESS. There is no question about it. That was a strong theme running throught the Conference. I think if we had to pick out key words through the Conference one would be "comprehensive," whether it is in the health field or the development day-care field.

Senator MONDALE. In other words, there was a very decided and strong recommendation against just sheer custodial care of children, and a strong emphasis on the family-centered nature of the program—not separation of children from their parents but a strengthening of the ties between family and child. Is that correct?

Mr. HESS. That is correct, sir.

Senator MONDALE. This is the central issue it seems to me, running through the whole family assistance plan. I am afraid at this point day care is sort of an afterthought in FAP. The emphasis in that bill seems to be on encouraging the mother to work, and what do you do with the children while she is working is sort of an afterthought.

The conference clearly came down on the side of qualitative developmental assistance which was family-centered, am I correct on that?

Mr. HESS. That is correct, sir.

Senator TAFT. If the chairman will yield, in that regard did you talk at all about the incentives and assistance in order to enable mothers who might otherwise have to work to remain with their families, talk about the impact on employment in this connection?

Mr. HESS. Not having personally been in the week of discussion at this particular forum, I hope you will address that question to Dr. Kagan, the chairman, and Mrs. Lansberg, the vice chairman, because they can truly give you a sense of the concerns of the people who were assigned to the day-care section. I was just not there, sir.

Senator MONDALE. I was told that at the recently concluded White House Conference on Youth there was quite a debate on the preamble, is that correct?

Mr. HESS. That is correct, sir.

Senator MONDALE. I was also struck that the same emphasis on nonclinical terms was to be found there. It is interesting that when you get the children and the youth and their specialists together, even though many of them are clinicians, they finally end up strongly emphasizing just the concept of love in the treatment of our children and youth, and I think many of our programs forget that.

We should start with that in the development of any program because the program that neglects that essential, difficult-to-find ingredient is bound to fail. Would you agree with that?

Mr. HESS. Yes, sir.

Senator MONDALE. It is interesting that the great specialists in this field end up often speaking in essentially religious terms. Eric Erickson talks of sin, and maybe it is an eloquent testimony of the gap that exists between how we think we are dealing with our children and how, in fact, we are damaging them, that specialists use such religiously charged words.

Would you agree with that?

Mr. HESS. I think that Dr. Bronfenbrenner would bear out that in the heated discussions that involved the drafting of the preamble to the children's Conference, which I read in my testimony, we ultimately rejected this as a political document and looked upon it really as a moral or almost religious document, yes.

Senator MONDALE. I think that is encouraging. Thank you very much.

Our first "pro" to testify before our new committee is Dr. Urie Bronfenbrenner. He comes here today having set aside many more compelling matters to perform this function. We are very pleased to have Dr. Bronfenbrenner with us and we are most grateful to him for his continuing critical contributions to this terribly important issue. Dr. Bronfenbrenner.

STATEMENT OF DR. URIE BRONFENBRENNER, PROFESSOR OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND FAMILY STUDIES, NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF HUMAN ECOLOGY, CORNELL UNIVERSITY, ITHACA, N.Y.

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I share the view of the chairman of the parent committee that this is a historic day. It marks the first session of the first congressional committee to be established for the express purpose of considering the needs and welfare of the Nation's children. The establishment of such a committee is long overdue. I hope that it does not come too late.

The reason for my concern is perhaps best conveyed by the opening paragraph of a report prepared for the White House Conference on Children by a committee under my chairmanship. The paragraph reads:

> America's families and their children are in trouble, *trouble so deep and pervasive* as to threaten the future of the nation. The source of the trouble is nothing less than a national neglect of children and those primarily engaged in their care—America's parents.

The members of this committee are already familiar with facts that point to this conclusion, but for the record I shall mention some of them. Let me begin, Mr. Chairman, by saying we now have the knowledge and the know-how to increase significantly the ability and competence of the next generation of children to be born in this country.

We know what is needed, we know how it can be done. All that remains is to do the job. The job can be done. At least a dozen nations are doing the job better than we do it now. By way of explanation, I shall start with some facts well known to this committee.

America, the richest and most powerful country in the world, stands 13th among the nations in combating infant mortality; even East Germany does better. Moreover, our ranking has dropped steadily in recent decades. A similar situation obtains with respect to maternal and child health, day care, children's allowances, and other basic services to children and families.

But the figures for the Nation as a whole, dismaying as they are, mask even greater inequities. For example, infant mortality for nonwhites in the United States is almost twice that for whites, and there are a number of Southern States and northern metropolitan areas, in which the ratios are considerably higher.

But the point I wish to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, is the following: Ironically, of even greater cost to the society than infants who die are the many more who sustain injury but survive with disability. Many of these suffer impaired intellectual function and behavioral disturbance including hyperactivity, distractability, and low attention span,

all factors contributing to school retardation and problem behavior.

Again, the destructive impact is greatest on the poorest segments of the population, especially nonwhites. It is all the more tragic that this massive damage and its subsequent cost in reduced productivity, lower income, unemployability, welfare payments, and institutionalization are avoidable if adequate nutrition, prenatal care and other family and child services are provided, as they are in a number of countries less prosperous than ours.

But it is not only children from disadvantaged families who show signs of progressive neglect. For example, an analysis I carried out a few years ago of data on child rearing practices in the United States over a 25-year period reveals a decrease, especially in recent years, in all spheres of interaction between parents and children.

A similar conclusion is indicated by results of cross-cultural studies comparing American parents with those from Western and Eastern Europe. Moreover, as parents and other adults move out of the lives of children, the vacuum is filled by the age-segregated peer group.

Recently my colleagues and I completed a study showing that, at every age and grade level, children today show a greater dependence on their peers than they did a decade ago. Our evidence indicates that susceptibility to group influence is higher among children from homes in which one or both parents are frequently absent.

In addition, "peer-oriented" youngsters describe their parents as less affectionate and less firm in discipline. Attachment to age-mates appears to be influenced more by a lack of attention and concern at home than by any positive attraction of the peer group itself.

In fact, these children have a rather negative view of their friends, and of themselves as well. They are pessimistic about the future, rate lower in responsibility and leadership, and are more likely to engage in such antisocial behavior as lying, teasing other children, "playing hooky" or "doing something illegal."

More recent evidence comes from a dissertation currently being completed by Mr. Michael Siman, a doctoral candidate at Cornell University's newly established College of Human Ecology. In keeping with an ecological perspective, Siman did something which, so far as I know, has never been done before. Working with a large sample of teenagers, ages 12 to 17, most of them from middle- and lower-middle-class homes in New York City, he went to a great deal of trouble to identify and study the actual peer groups in which these adolescents spend so much of their time.

There were 41 such peer groups in all. Siman was interested in determining the relative influence of parents versus peers on the behavior of the teenager. Three classes of behavior were studied:

1. Socially constructive activities such as taking part in sports, helping someone who needs help, telling the truth, doing useful work for the neighborhood or community without pay, et cetera.

2. Neutral activities such as listening to records, spending time with the family, et cetera.

3. Antisocial activities such as playing hooky, doing something illegal, hurting people, et cetera.

Siman also obtained information on the extent to which each teenager perceived these activities to be approved or disapproved by his parents and by the members of his peer group. The results are instruc-

tive. In the case of boys, for example, he finds that for all three classes of behavior, peers are substantially more influential than parents.

In fact, in most cases, once the attitudes of the peer group are taken into account, the attitudes of the parents make no difference whatsoever. The only exceptions are in the area of constructive behavior, where the parent does have some influence secondary to the peer group.

But in the neutral, and especially the antisocial sphere, the peer group is all determining. When it comes to such behaviors as doing something illegal, smoking, or aggression, once the attitude of the peer group is taken into account, the parents' disapproval carries no weight.

What we are seeing here, of course, are the roots of alienation and its milder consequences. The more serious manifestations are reflected in the rising rates of youthful drug abuse, delinquency, and violence documented in charts and tables specially prepared for the White House Conference on Children.

According to these data the proportion of youngsters between the ages of 10 and 18 arrested for drug abuse doubled between 1964 and 1968; since 1963, juvenile delinquency has been increasing at a faster rate than the juvenile population; over half of the crimes involve vandalism, theft, or breaking and entry; and if the present trends continue, one out of every nine youngsters will appear in juvenile court before age 18. These figures index only detected and prosecuted offenses. How high must they run before we acknowledge that they reflect deep and pervasive problems in the treatment of children and youth in our society?

Who is responsible for the national neglect of our children? When a child's problem becomes so serious that it can no longer be overlooked, there are those who are all too ready to fix the blame on parents. Parents don't care enough about their children, they charge. To take this view, however, is to misjudge the problem and absolve from responsibility those who actually bear it.

Although systematic evidence on the question is difficult to obtain there are grounds for believing that parents today, far from not caring about their children, are more worried about them than they have ever been in the course of recent history.

The crux of the problem, as indicated by Mr. Siman's data, is that many parents have become powerless as forces in the lives of their children. Again, the situation is most succinctly described in the aforementioned report to the White House Conference. I quote:

> In today's world, parents find themselves at the mercy of a society which imposes pressures and priorities that allow neither time nor place for meaningful activities and relations between children and adults, which downgrade the role of parents and the functions of parenthood, and which prevent the parent from doing things he wants to do as a guide, friend, and companion to his children.
>
> The frustrations are greatest for the family of poverty where the capacity for human response is crippled by hunger, cold, filth, sickness, and despair. No parent who spends his days in search of menial work, and his nights in keeping rats away from the crib can be expected to find the time, let alone the heart, to engage in constructive activities with his children or serve as a stable source of love and discipline.
>
> The fact that some beleaguered parents manage to do so is a tribute to them but not to the society in which they live.
>
> For families who can get along, the rats are gone, but the rat race remains. The demands of a job, or often two jobs, that claim mealtimes, evenings, and week-ends as well as days; the trips and moves necessary to get ahead or simply

hold one's own; the ever-increasing time spent in commuting, parties, evenings out, social and community obligations—all the things one has to do to meet so-called primary responsibilities—produce a situation in which a child often spends more time with a passive babysitter than a participating parent.

And even when the parent is at home, a compelling force cuts off communication and response among the family members. Although television could, if used creatively, enrich the activities of children and families, it now only undermines them.

Like the sorcerer of old, the television set casts its magic spell, freezing speech and action and turning the living into silent statues so long as the enchantment lasts. The primary danger of the television screen lies not so much in the behavior it produces as the behavior it prevents—the talks, the games, the family festivities and arguments through which much of the child's learning takes place and his character is formed. Turning on the television set can turn off the process that transforms children into people.

In our modern way of life, children are deprived not only of parents but of people in general. A host of factors conspire to isolate children from the rest of society. The fragmentation of the extended family, the separation of residential and business areas, the disappearance of neighborhoods, zoning ordinances, occupational mobility, child labor laws, the abolishment of the apprentice system, consolidated schools, television, separate patterns of social life for different age groups, the working mother, the delegation of child care to specialists—all of these manifestations of progress operate to decrease opportunity and incentive for meaningful contact between children and persons older, or younger, than themselves.

And here we confront a fundamental and disturbing fact: Children need people in order to become human. The fact is fundamental because it is firmly grounded both in scientific research and in human experience. It is disturbing because the isolation of children from adults simultaneously threatens the growth of the individual and the survival of the society.

The young cannot pull themselves up by their own bootstraps. It is primarily through observing, playing, and working with others older and younger than himself that a child discovers both what he can do and who he can become—that he develops both his ability and his identity.

It is primarily through exposure and inter-relation with adults and children of different ages that a child acquires new interests and skills and learns the meaning of tolerance, cooperation and compassion. Hence to relegate children to a world of their own is to deprive them of their humanity and ourselves as well

Senator JAVITS. If I may interrupt here, first I would like to apologize to you because you are a professor from Cornell and my own State, and I have a hearing going on down the hall on the war powers bill which is my bill and I simply have to be there.

Second, I would like to ask the Chair's leave to insert in the record an opening statement welcoming and praising both Mr. Hess and yourself, him for his work at the White House Conference on Youth and you for what I know will be most erudite and helpful testimony.

Senator MONDALE. Without objection, so ordered. The Senator failed to mention that we are also in the process today of trying to pass a bill which Senator Javits was instrumental in shaping, to establish a national policy of stable quality integrated education. Senator Javits is essential in bringing that about.

Mr. BRONFENBRENNER. Thank you, sir. I am well aware of your efforts on behalf of children and we would much rather have you on the floor than here.

Senator MONDALE. Thank you, and you may proceed.

Mr. BRONFENBRENNER. Yet, this is what is happening in America today. We are experiencing a breakdown in the process of making human beings human. By isolating our children from the rest of society, we abandon them to a world devoid of adults and ruled by the

destructive impulses and compelling pressures both of the age-segregated peer group and the aggressive and exploitive television screen.

By setting our priorities elsewhere and putting children and families last, by claiming one set of values while pursuing another, we leave our children bereft of standards and support and our own lives impoverished and corrupted.

This reversal of priorities, which amounts to a betrayal of our children, underlies the growing disillusionment and alienation among young people in all segments of American society.

Those who grew up in settings where children and families still counted are able to react to their frustration in positive ways—through constructive protest, participation, and public service.

Those who come from circumstances in which the family could not function, be it slum or suburb, can only strike out against an environment they have experienced as indifferent, callous, cruel and unresponsive.

We do not condone the destruction and violence manifested by our young people in widely disparate sections of our society. We merely point to the roots of a process which, if not reversed, will continue to spread.

The failure to reorder our priorities, the insistence on business as usual, and the continued reliance on rhetoric as a substitute for fundamental reforms can only have one result:

The far more rapid and pervasive growth of alienation, apathy, drugs, delinquency and violence among the young and not so young, in all segments of our national life.

We face the prospect of a society which resents its own children and fears its youth. Surely this is a road to national destruction.

This is not the road for America. Our society still has the capacity and the value commitment necessary to reverse the trend.

What is needed is a change in our patterns of living which will once again bring people back into the lives of children and a change which will bring children back into the lives of people.

The main body of our report to the White House Conference was devoted to concrete steps that might be taken to bring about the reinvolvement of adults and children in each others lives.

Most of these recommendations were addressed not to the Federal Government nor to the States but to local communities and their constituent institutions.

For example, our first and longest set of recommendations was addressed to industry, business and government as employers. The report took the position that:

> More than any other institution in our country, it is American business and industry that will determine the fate of the American family and the American child. More than any institution, they have the power to reverse the present trend and to place families and children at the center rather than the periphery of our national life.

As an illustration of how this might be done, we cited examples from other societies which broke down the barrier between children and adults by bringing children into the world of work. To show how this policy could be implemented in our own society, Dr. David Goslin

of the Russell Sage Foundation persuaded one of America's great newspapers, the Detroit Free Press, to participate in an unusual experiment.

Twelve-year-old children from two Detroit schools, one from a slum area, the other predominately middle class, spent 6 to 7 hours a day for 3 days in virtually every department of that great newspaper, not just observing, but actively participating in the department's activities.

There were boys and girls in the press room, the city room, the composing room, the advertising department, and the dispatch department. The employees at the Free Press entered into the experiment with serious misgivings. "What are those kids going to do, just sit around?"

The outcome is perhaps best summarized by the remark of one staff member recorded in the documentary film we made of this experiment. Looking out from the 15th floor in the evening, after the children had left, he says quietly, "Now when I look out at the city with all those buildings, and all those lights, I see children in every one of the houses."

As I have said, most of the recommendations of the report were addressed to the constituent institutions of the society rather than to the Nation as a whole. We offered what we hoped were practical suggestions for the consideration of industry, business, neighborhoods, schools, and individual families.

Nevertheless, in the concluding section we did address a series of recommendations to the Federal Government, and I should like to make some comments in that regard. In my view, the primary role of the Federal Government, and of committees such as this one, is to exercise national leadership in rededicating our institutions and our people to a concern for the children and youth of this Nation. There are several points I would emphasize in this regard:

First, there can be no doubt that day care is coming to America. The question is: What kind? Shall we follow the pattern of certain other nations in which day care programs have served further to separate the child from his family and reduce the family's and the community's feeling of responsibility for their children? Or, shall the American model of day care retain and rededicate our commitment to the family as the primary and proper agent for the process of making human beings human?

The answer to those questions depends on the extent to which day-care programs are so located and so organized as to encourage rather than to discourage the involvement of parents in the development and operation of the program both at the center and in the home.

Like Project Headstart, day-care programs can have no lasting constructive impact on the development of the child unless they affect not only the child himself but the people who constitute his enduring day-to-day environment in the family, neighborhood, and community.

This means not only that parents must play an active part in the planning and administration of day-care programs, but that they must actively participate in the activities of the program as volunteers and aides.

It means that the program cannot be confined to the center, but must reach out into the home and the community so that the whole

neighborhood is caught up in activities in behalf of its children. From this point of view, we need to experiment in the location of day-care centers in places that are within reach of the significant people in the child's life.

For some families, this means neighborhood centers; for others, centers at the place of work. A great deal of variation and innovation will be required to find the appropriate solutions for different groups in different settings.

In keeping with the foregoing point, I would emphasize that in the first instance, children need people, not professionals. Nowhere is the power of this principle illustrated more effectively than in Harold Skeels' remarkable followup study of two groups of mentally retarded, institutionalized children, who constituted the experimental and control groups in an experiment he had initiated 30 years earlier.

When the children were 3 years of age, 13 of them were placed in the care of female inmates of a State institution for the mentally retarded with each child being assigned to a different ward.

A control group was allowed to remain in the original, also institutional, environment—a children's orphanage. During the formal experimental period, which averaged a year and a half, the experimental group showed a gain in IQ of 28 points, whereas the control group dropped 26 points.

Upon completion of the experiment it became possible to place the institutionally mothered children in legal adoption. Thirty years later all 13 children in the experimental group were found to be self-supporting, all but two had completed high school, with four having 1 or more years of college.

In the control group, all were either dead or still institutionalized. Skeels concludes his report with some dollar figures on the amount of taxpayer's money expended to sustain the institutionalized group, in contrast to the productive income brought in by those who had been raised initially by mentally deficient women in a State institution.

What accounted for these dramatic gains? The answer is to be found in Skeels' careful observations of what happened in the wards of that institution for female defectives. In each instance, one of the inmates in effect adopted the infant and became its mother, but in addition, the entire ward was caught up in activities in behalf of "our baby."

New clothes and playthings appeared and the children were lavished with attention. Indeed, the several wards began to compete with each other in terms of whose baby was developing most rapidly.

The Skeels' experiment illustrates a fundamental principle: The extent to which children receive the kind of care and attention which is necessary for their development depends on the extent to which those who have responsibility for their care are provided with a place, a time, and the encouragement to engage in activities with young children.

This does not mean that professionals are not important. Quite the contrary, we need professionals, but their primary task should be not to work with the children themselves but to help create the kind of conditions and situations in which parents and others who carry the responsibility for the day-to-day care of children can function effectively as human beings.

In this connection, I should like to quote a Soviet colleague's reply to my question as to why the Russians are discontinuing, as they are, their planned expansion of boarding institutions for the general care and education of young children:

> If you promise not to quote me by name, I will tell you the real reason, you can't pay a woman to do what a mother will do for free.

Senator MONDALE. I wonder if this wouldn't be a good point to include Dr. Menninger's description of the boarding schools of the Navaho, which is the strategy that we have been undertaking for 30 or 40 or 50 years to get the children of the ages 5 to 14 away from their parents and into a "healthy environment" to make "good white men" out of them.

He said that he has never seen anything more barbaric, he has never seen anxiety levels higher than those recorded in those boarding schools. They have been a colossal failure. The whole theory was "if we can get the children away from their parents we can really begin to work on them"—and we really have.

Mr. BRONFENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, it is no accident that in a million years of evolution we have emerged with a particular form for the raising of children and it is the human family and we should be very careful in fiddling with something that has managed to do well for us long before we had Ph. D's, like myself, in child development.

My colleague's pithy statement points to still another consideration profoundly affecting the welfare of children in our Nation. I refer to the place and status of women in American society.

Setting aside the question of whether women are more gifted than men for the care of young children, the fact remains that in our society today, it is on the women, and especially on mothers, that the care of our children depends.

Moreover, with the disappearance of the social supports for the family, to which I alluded earlier, the position of mothers has become increasingly isolated. With the breakdown of the community, the neighborhood, and the extended family, an increasingly greater burden for the care and upbringing of children has fallen on the young mother.

Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that many young women in America are in the process of revolt. I for one understand and share their sense of rage, but I fear the consequences of some of the solutions they advocate, which will have the effect of isolating children still further from the kind of care and attention they need.

There is, of course, a constructive course of action open to us, one that in the long run will benefit children, women and the entire society, including the men.

Mr. Chairman, a major route to the rehabilitation of children and youth in American society lies in the enhancement of the status and power of women in all walks of life—both on the job and in the home.

As I read the research evidence, the ideal arrangement for the development of the young child is one in which his mother is free to work part time, for only in this way can she be the full person that being an effective parent requires.

What are the implications of these kinds of considerations for legislation? I would make the following points:

1. The national programs we establish must be programs for the development of children and families. Like Project Headstart, they must be designed to improve not just the environment of the child, but the environment of those who can and will have the most impact on his development.

2. In keeping with the foregoing principle, it is essential that programs be so designed as to enhance rather than destroy the integrity of families. For example, admission requirements should not discriminate against single parent families, or families in which a parent works only part-time.

3. Programs must be adapted to the language, culture, and values of the families whose children they serve.

4. Programs should be designed in such a way as to maximize the involvement in activities with the children of parents, neighbors, older children, and all those persons who make up the enduring social environment of the child.

5. Programs should be so designed as to enhance the integrity of the neighborhood and community in which the families of the children live or work.

6. Programs cannot be limited to the period of early childhood. The most impressive progress during the first years of life can be undone by a destructive environment in the school or in the peer group.

Senator MONDALE. Would you yield there? Don't you sense that some preschool advocates are guilty of faddism in that sense—that they promise too much for these programs, that there is a compelling overwheming need for quality comprehensive preschool help but not as the single thing, and that emphasis on it is required because, strangely, with regard to this foundation building period the American society has stood neutral. What we want to do is get them involved.

Mr. BRONFENBRENNER. I would most certainly agree. While we stand neutral in this early childhood period, and we did not stand neutral in the later period, I think one can say, as I shall in a moment, that with respect to what happens with children after preschool we are perhaps guilty not even of neutrality but of heinous harm to young people.

7. Of crucial importance for the welfare and development of school age children is the reintegration of schools into the life of the community. Above all, we must reverse the present trend toward the construction and administration of schools as isolated compounds divorced from the rest of the community.

Many such schools are becoming quasi-penal institutions in which teachers are increasingly found to function as guards and detectives and pupils are treated as suspects or prisoners for whom liberty is a special privilege.

Senator MONDALE. Did you add that point?

Mr. BRONFENBRENNER. I most certainly did.

Senator MONDALE. As an afterthought?

Mr. BRONFENBRENNER. No, sir; it was not an afterthought, what I added were the things that I labored on in the night last night.

8. As a necessary step to the reintegration of schools and children into the community, programs should be encouraged which involve members of the community in the school program and children in the activities of the community. Such involvement should take the form

not merely of duties and chores but of genuine responsibilities involving consequential decisions for which the young person is held accountable.

I may say parenthetically, I view the present trend toward letting everybody "do his thing" as a very dangerous one because it implies "I don't care what you do, you don't care what I do." And this is what many schools are now teaching to our children.

9. Of special significance for children of all ages is the development of programs which involve older children in genuine responsibility for the care of the young. For this reason it is desirable to locate day care and preschool programs such as Headstart in or near schools and to integrate such programs into the regular school curriculum as a means of preparing young people for parenthood and awareness of the needs of young children and their families.

10. Programs should provide for the active involvement of all the institutions in the community. This includes not only those that have direct and acknowledged impact on children and families, such as school boards, welfare departments, recreation and police departments, but also other institutions whose impact on family life is often unrecognized but profound.

These include local businesses and industries, planning commissions, architects, park commissions, all those institutions that determine the ecology of where children can or can not spend their time.

11. Programs should provide for the training not only of professionals but a whole new class of paraprofessional workers in such areas as nutrition, early child care, recreation work, et cetera. Wherever possible such persons should come from the child's own community and cultural background.

12. Finally, as I hope the first part of my testimony demonstrates, the support of systematic research is an essential element of any national program. Such research must be conducted not only in the laboratory but in the actual settings in which children live and grow.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you and your colleagues for this opportunity. I trust the establishment of this committee will herald the beginning of a new era of life for America's children and youth and thereby a renewed humanity for all of our people.

Thank you, sir.

Senator MONDALE. Thank you for what I regard to be one of the ablest and most moving statements that I have heard on the issue of our children and our society. I am most grateful to you for not only being here but for the strength that you have given to this statement.

You indicated early in your statement that by international standards we don't compare too well. You indicated later on that there is evidence the Russians may be cooling off on the idea of separating children from their parents. Is there any society which, in your opinion, could be looked to as having established a model parent-child early childhood effort to which we might turn in our work?

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. Before answering that question, Mr. Chairman, I should like to issue a caution. The solution for any society depends, of course, on the realities in that particular society.

What fits well in one society may not fit well in another and what fits in one community or what fits one ethnic group or a group of a

particular tradition may not fit another. So I would be cautious about importing other society's programs.

Nevertheless, there are principles implicit in the programs that other societies conduct from which I think we can learn. With respect to the Soviet society, for example, I want to make clear there are many different forms of hell, Mr. Chairman.

We happen to have one for our children, theirs is another, in a sense. They are not guilty of neglect of their children but they make sure that the children become the kind of people they want. There is a problem in that.

At the same time one must, I think, take cognizance of the wisdom of the following kinds of institutions which one finds in Soviet society.

For example, in every Soviet school each grade has the responsibility for a younger grade. They call it adoption. This means that the activities of the older grade are judged by how well the younger kids are doing.

The sixth grade will adopt a third grade or a third grade will adopt a preschool group. They play with the children, escort them to their homes, get to know their parents, teach them games, help them with their schoolwork. It is a very character building experience for the older group and profoundly important for the young because as many of us will recall from our own childhood an older child is in many ways a much more powerful model than an adult who could do all those things, but that is because he is a grownup, not like me.

But an older child who is nearer you in age is somebody whom you can begin to try to be like.

Another example of a Russian program which merits attention is the custom of having every place of business, factory, shops, institute, ministry, also adopt some children's group, a hospital ward, a nursery program, a class, as "our children."

They bring the kids to the place of work and show them what they are doing and they go on outings with the kids and get to know their parents. These are examples of principles.

Take another situation entirely. We have heard much in this country about the Israeli kibbutz. My colleagues and I at Cornell and the University of Tel Aviv are currently engaged in a comparative study of socialization or upbringing in four different settings, in Israel: The kibbutzine, which are settlements in which the children are raised cooperatively; the moshavim, which are also agricultural supplements, where the children live in or grow up at home in the parents' home; then, children in ordinary villages that don't have a cooperative economic arrangement; and finally, groups from various parts of the world living in Jerusalem in an urban environment.

The kibbutz situation, contrary to our impressions, is not one in which children are raised without their parents. Quite the contrary, our data indicate that for example, for 12-year-olds, the average 12-year-old reports—one has to be careful because these data are in children standard time which has only a remote relationship to real time—we asked the kids how much time they spend doing something with a father, a mother, or both parents together and the average

during the weekday for 12-year-old kibbutz children is approximately 4½ hours every day.

The reason for this, as our observations show, is that the kibbutz is a small community, the children's house is in the middle, everybody is working here and there. There is a definite time in the late afternoon and evening that is set aside as the children's hour and everybody stops working and the children come home.

You are not reading your paper while they are watching television, you are doing something together because that is the tradition. Take one more example just to get contrast. We are doing studies also in Switzerland and in Hungary. Both of these societies have interesting frameworks around which the life of families and the life of children is built.

In Switzerland it is the mountains that bring the grandparents and the parents and the kids out in challenging activities. In Hungary, curiously enough, the pictures that you see in the Hungarian schoolroom are those of the great Hungarian composers, Bartok and Kodaly. Music, singing, and family music become a major context around which the lives of children are related to the lives of others.

I mention these diverse examples to indicate to you there is no simple solution. One must draw on one's own cultural tradition, one's own identities, for the institutions that will answer.

We in America are not bereft of such traditions and identities. Neighborliness is an old concept in American life, as old as rugged individualism and I hope as strong. What we need is to once again reestablish the situations in which people can be neighbors and can be engaged in cooperative activities, again both in work and in play and which once again break down these lines of age segregation which keep children out of life.

Senator MONDALE. In Israel, they have the open door policy by which Jews of different cultures are permitted free entry. They have accepted over the past many years so-called oriental Jews who come from disadvantaged cultures, and they have sought to educate those children, to bring them into the mainstream of life in Israel and to do away with the invidious distinctions that could occur there.

I am often struck by the similarity between that effort in Israel and our approach to what one student called the FOB list, that is "fresh off the boat." When you think of our migrant, Puerto Rican, Portugese, Filipino, Mexican-American populations, and really if you take the reservation Indian for that matter, when they are introduced into whatever we call the American society the cultural and educational and psychological clash is total.

Yet we have nothing that I can see in our society which undertakes a similar effort. Do you see a parallel or a model in Israel which might be helpful to use in that regard?

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. Yes and no. First I would say that I think we have a tendency to idealize the Israeli situation and the position of the oriental Jew is perhaps not quite as devoid of problems as we like to think.

I think we both have serious problems in this regard. But there is a lesson to be learned because the thing about the Israeli society is that it is much more adventuresome than ours in being willing to try new approaches.

However, in a curious way I would turn the tables on your statement. It seems to me that the group that has to profit most from the resolution of these problems in American society is perhaps not the minority groups but our great majority, because what we are suffering from in our Nation today and what the youth are calling to our attention, Mr. Chairman, is the disappearance of compassion. Compassion is learned essentially by being compassionate, and that means being aware of and responsive to the needs of the suffering. That means the old, the sick, the dispossessed, the disenfranchised.

The great white majority in this country is the one who, as we mentioned earlier, belongs.

Senator MONDALE. I am most grateful. In the administration's bill H.R. 1, the only reference to the very recommendations you are making is found on page 179, "Such project shall provide for various types of child care needed in the light of the different circumstances and needs of the children involved."

In my understanding that is the only reference to the child in the whole day care section of the family assistance plan. Would you comment on that emphasis and what you think ought to be the proper emphasis?

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. My views on this matter are recorded in testimony on that bill before the House Ways and Means Committee. In speaking of that bill, I would say the only positive thing I could say in its favor, which was an important thing to say in its favor, is that it does represent an improvement over our present legislation, it is an improvement over the horror that we now operate under.

But in terms of concern for children and families, that bill not only leaves much to be desired but contains elements that I think are harmful.

Senator MONDALE. Isn't it possible that a national program of custodial child care could be far more destructive than no program at all for the reasons you have cited?

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. Precisely, and that is the danger.

Senator MONDALE. And the answer that something is better than nothing is most misleading when the something you are talking about is separating the mother from her children?

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. Exactly.

Senator MONDALE. In that case, nothing is better than something.

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. And that bill could very easily lead to that kind of situation. What I urged in my testimony was the insertion in that bill of the kinds of positive statements about children and families which are contained in most of the bills currently under consideration in the Senate and the House including notably your own, Senators Javits' and Congressman Brademas' bill.

All of these bills contain a clear recognition that children come first, whereas, as you correctly said earlier, that bill unfortunately is really designed to take care of children so that we can get people back to work.

Senator MONDALE. I have been trying to evade a quorum call for 20 minutes and the Sergeant at Arms has just ordered me personally over there so I think I had better go before they come in and arrest me.

Thank you very, very much for this valuable statement.

67-582 O—71——4

(Supplemental material submitted by Dr. Bronfenbrenner subsequent to the hearing follows:)

Development Research and Public Policy

By Dr. Urie Bronfenbrenner [1]

This paper examines the implications of research on children for the design of social policies and programs that can enhance the process of human development. Three questions are explored:

1. What can be learned from available research regarding the conditions that foster the development of the child?
2. To what extent do these conditions obtain for children in contemporary American society?
3. What kinds of programs and policies would ensure more effective provision of the conditions that foster human development?

I. THE CONDITIONS WHICH FOSTER HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

It is obvious that the needs of children vary with age. Accordingly, we start our discussion with the factors affecting human development in infancy.

We begin with what may appear as a preposterous assertion. Science already possesses the knowledge and the know-how to increase significantly the ability and competence of the next generation of children to be born in this country. The key to this magic measure is implicit in an often quoted statistic. America, the richest and most powerful country in the world, stands thirteenth among the nations in combating infant mortality; even East Germany does better (Profiles of Children, p. 91). Moreover, our ranking has dropped steadily in recent decades.[2] A similar situation obtains with respect to maternal and child health, day care, children's allowances, and other basic services to children and families.

But the figures for the nation as a whole, dismaying as they are, mask even greater inequities. For example, infant mortality for non-Whites in the United States is almost twice that for Whites, and there are a number of Southern states and Northern metropolitan areas in which the ratios are considerably higher (Profiles of Children, pp. 90–92).

The implications of these statistics are more significant than the facts themselves. Of even greater cost to the society than the infants who die are the many more who sustain injury but survive with disability. Many of these suffer impaired intellectual function and behavioral disturbance including hyperactivity, distractability, and low attention span—all factors contributing to school retardation and problem behavior. Again, the destructive impact is greatest on the poorest segments of the population, especially non-Whites. It is all the more tragic that this massive damage, and its subsequent cost in reduced productivity, lower income, unemployability, welfare payments, and institutionalization are avoidable if adequate nutrition, maternal care, and other family and child services are provided, as they are in a number of countries less prosperous than ours.

In addition to health care, what other conditions ensure and enhance the development of the child in the early years of life? To answer this question, we must acquaint ourselves with the basic processes through which the infant's behavior and growth can be shaped by his external environment. In the first months of life, the environment makes its impact primarily through the intervention of other persons who are the child's caretakers, especially his mother. Embedded in the mother's activities are at least two processes which research reveals are especially powerful in molding the infant's behaviors and skills.

The first of these is familiar to everyone who has had an introductory course in psychology: *reinforcement*. Defined succinctly, though perhaps not very informatively, reinforcement is the process of altering the probability of a response by a contingent response to that response. For example, researchers have demonstrated that a young infant's vocalization can be increased by following his spontaneous utterance with a reaction involving "a broad smile, three 'tsk'

---

[1] Professor of Human Development and Family Studies, New York State College of Human Ecology at Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

[2] Except as otherwise noted, comparative data on child development cited in this paper are documented in Bronfenbrenner, U. *Two Worlds of Childhood*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1970, see especially pp. 95–124.

sounds, and a light touch applied to the infant's abdomen with thumb and fingers of the hand opposed" (Rheingold, Gewritz, & Ross, 1959). If the language for describing this set of stimuli sounds a bit stilted, the stimuli themselves are clearly not. Indeed, the actions of others revealed by research as the most powerful in shaping the young infant's behavior and development turn out to be precisely the sorts of things that mothers, fathers, aunts, uncles, grandparents, and visitors in the home have done since time immemorial in the presence of young babies. Moreover, if one is interested in having the infant retain the response he has learned, the reinforcement should be given not every time, but only some of the time—which is of course exactly what all these friendly people do.

Powerful as it is, reinforcement has one major limitation. The infant must exhibit the response before it can be reinforced. The problem therefore arises, how can one elicit the response in the first place. This brings us to the second major strategy for shaping the behavior and development of the young child. Although rediscovered and given a new name in recent years, the process has deep roots in human history and evolution. This is the phenomenon of *imitation*—"monkey see, monkey do," referred to in contemporary psychological research and theory as *modeling*. As soon as his maturational development permits, an infant is likely to copy behavior that he sees exhibited by others. For example, a recent study reports that as early as six weeks of age, an infant imitates such behaviors as sticking out one's tongue, opening and closing the mouth, and, to a lesser extent, hand and finger movements (Gardner & Gardner, 1970). Thus modeling provides a mechanism for introducing new behaviors into the infant's repertoire, which can then be further perfected and accelerated through reinforcement.

Is it possible to increase an infant's succeptibility to reinforcement and modeling? An answer to this question is provided by an insightful observational study conducted at the National Institutes of Health by Howard Moss (1967). Moss investigated interaction of mothers with their infants at two different age levels—three weeks and three months—and found striking differences in pattern. At three weeks, it was the infant who gave the process both its impetus and direction. At the core of the interaction was the infant's cry. In Moss's words:

. . . It is the infant's cry that is determining the maternal behavior. Mothers describe the cry as a signal that the infant needs attention and they often report their nurturant actions in response to the cry. Furthermore, the cry is a noxious and often painful stimulus that probably has biological utility for the infant, propelling the mother into action for her own comfort as well as out of concern for the infant. . . . Thus we are adopting the hypothesis that . . . the cry acts to instigate maternal intervention.

By three months, however, the initiative has passed to the mother, paradoxically as a function of the infant's own activity.

. . . We propose that maternal behavior initially tends to be under the control of the stimulus and reinforcing conditions provided by the young infant. As the infant gets older, the mother, if she behaved contingently toward his signals, gradually acquires reinforcement value which in turn increases her efficacy in regulating infant behaviors. . . . Thus, at first the mother is shaped by the infant and this later facilitates her shaping the behavior of the infant. We would therefore say that the infant through his own temperament or signal system contributes to establishing the stimulus and reinforcement value eventually associated with the mother. According to this reasoning, the more irritable infants (who can be soothed) whose mothers respond in a contingent manner to their signals should become most amenable to the effects of social reinforcement and manifest a higher degree of attachment behavior.

In sort, for mother-infant interaction to be maximally effective in fostering the child's development, it must be a two-way process. (Bell, 1968; Rheingold, 1969) This principle applies not only to reinforcement, but also to modeling. As documented in the work of a number of investigators, not only does the child imitate the mother, but the mother also imitates the child and this in turn facilitates his psychological development (Moss, 1966; Kagan, 1968; Tulkin and Kagan, 1970; Tulkin and Cohler, in press).

Finally, where the pattern of reciprocal reinforcement and modeling takes place within the context of an enduring relationship with another person, it leads to the development of a mutual dependency relationship which in turn increases susceptibility to both reinforcement and modeling on the part of both

participants in the relationship (Bronfenbrenner, 1968; Caldwell, Hersher, Lipton, Richmond, Stern, Eddy, Bachman, & Rothman, 1963).

What are the implications of the foregoing principles for the development of programs? The answer is provided by ongoing research on the effects of intervention with a sample of 180 two-year-old boys living in Harlem. The experimental groups were exposed to two treatment conditions Labeled Concept Training and Discovery.

Under both conditions, the child interacted with the instructor on a one-to-one basis, meeting with him for two one-hour sessions a week over an eight month period. The children assigned to the Concept Training group were systematically taught concepts selected to increase their ability to make discriminations along dimensions of size, texture, position, form, quantity, etc. . . .

The purpose of the other experimental condition, the Discovery group, was to allow us to distinguish between effects due to interacting with adults on a one-to-one basis and playing with materials not normally available, and effects due to the teaching of specific concepts. Thus, no attempt was made to teach concepts to the children in the Discovery group. The same materials and toys used with the Concept group were used with these children, but they were in a free play setting. The instructor was told to speak only if the child asked a question and to play with him as though they were in a typical nursery school.

In both conditions the child was provided with the opportunity for uninterrupted, mutual interaction with an adult in a situation providing increasingly complex stimuli requiring increasingly complex responses. (Palmer and Rees, 1969)

After eight months of training, both experimental groups outdid their controls. Moreover, children from lower socioeconomic background in the experimental group outperformed the middle class children in the control group, and the gains were retained when the groups were retested a year later. Finally, contrary to investigators' expectations, at the time of retesting the Discovery group emerged as superior to the Concept Training group. Palmer and Rees offer the following interpretation of this result:

It appears that what is taught is not as important as the condition under which it is taught; specifically, the adult-child, one-to-one relationship. . . . Any weil conceived instructor training program may have equally beneficial effects provided training is introduced early enough in the child's life and there is a systemetic, uninterrupted relationship between instructor and child over an extended period of time.

In this writer's view, however, this conclusion beclouds the critical difference between the two groups. According to the investigators' own statements, children in both groups experienced an uninterrupted one-to-one relationship. The crucial difference between them had to do with the fact that in the Concept Training group, the initiative lay overwhelmingly with the instructor, whereas in the Discovery group the instructor could be responsive to the child. In other words, the discovery treatment permitted and encouraged a two-way process in which the adult and the child could reinforce each other, imitate each other, and develop a mutual attachment which in turn enhanced their influence on each other's behavior.

We are now in a position to summarize our conclusions in the form of a single integrating principle: In the early years of life, *the psychological development of the child is enhanced through his involvement in progressively more complex, enduring patterns of reciprocal contingent interaction with persons with whom he has established a mutual and enduring emotional attachment.*

Before proceeding to a second major principle, it is important to make explicit one of the implications of the foregoing proposition at a more down-to-earth level. The proposition, it will be observed, makes rather exacting demands on the adult participants. Anyone who proposes to provide the child with the specified conditions better realize what he is getting into. In this connection. the author is reminded of a reply made by a Soviet colleague to the question of why the Russians were discontinuing, as they are, their planned expansion of boarding institutions for the care and education of children. His answer: "You can't pay a woman to do what a mother will do for free."

To make the same point more explicitly, the only person who will be willing to do all the things that need to be done in order to foster the development of a young child is likely to be someone who has an irrational attachment to that child. There are of course other less pejorative terms for "irrational attachment", the most common one being love.

But in a scientific paper, one should eschew subjective terms. Accordingly, we shall remain operational and speak not of love, but of its functional manifestation in adult-infant interaction; namely, the presence of a reciprocal system involving reinforcement, modeling, and mutual attachment. Under what kinds of conditions is such a system most likely to develop? There are two investigations that shed some light on this issue. The first is a comparative study of maternal behavior and infant development in two types of family structures, referred to as *monomatric* and *polymatric* (Caldwell, Hersher, Lipton, Richmond, Stern, Eddy, Drachman, & Rothman, 1963). In the former, the baby was cared for by only one person—his mother; in the latter, there was more than one mother figure available to the child, such as a maternal grandmother, aunt, older sister, etc. The sample was drawn from mothers attending a prenatal clinic operated by a city health department. The investigators used a variety of methods to study mother-infant interaction, including observations and developmental scales. By the time the infants were six months of age, there were marked differences in the behavior of the mothers in the two types of family structure, and some differences in their offspring as well, but, by the end of the first year, the differences were greater for the infants than for their mothers. The results of the study are summarized by the authors as follows: "The infant whose early social experiences are monitored principally by one female caretaker finds it somewhat easier to learn to relate to other people, is slightly more comfortable and active in strange and possibly frightening surroundings, and exhibits more positive affect in interactive sequences with his mother" (Page 658). Through an analysis of interview data obtained from mothers before their babies were born, the investigators established differences in the personality characteristics of mothers who were later to provide polymatric versus monomatric environments for their children, with mothers in the former group being rated as more hostile, dominant, and dependent in their interpersonal relationships. The authors also report that most of the women came from economically deprived circumstances; approximately half had been on welfare at some time, one-third were Negro, and several were unwed or separated from their husbands. It seems likely that differences in adjustment prior to and after childbirth are not unrelated to such differences in social background, but, unfortunately, the authors did not carry out an analysis of this kind.

The impact of situational factors on maternal care is even more explicitly demonstrated in Skeels' (1966) remarkable follow up study of two groups of mentally retarded, institutionalized children, who constituted the experimental and control groups in an experiment he had initiated thirty years earlier (Skeels, Updegraff, Wallman, and Williams, 1938; Skeels and Dye, 1939). When the children were three years of age, thirteen of them were placed in the care of female inmates of a state institution for the mentally retarded with each child being assigned to a different ward. The control group was allowed to remain in the original—also institutional—environment, a children's orphanage. During the formal experimental period, which averaged a year and a half, the experimental group showed a gain in IQ of 28 points, whereas the control group dropped 26 points. Upon completion of the experiment, it became possible to place the institutionally-mothered childred in legal adoption. Thirty years later, all thirteen children in the experimental group were found to be self supporting, all but two had completed high school, with four having one or more years of college. In the control group, all were either dead or still institutionalized. Skeels concludes his report with some dollar figures on the amount of taxpayers' money expended to sustain the institutionalized group, in contrast to the productive income brought in by those who had been raised initially by mentally deficient women in a state institution.

What accounted for these dramatic gains? The answer is to be found in Skeels' careful observations of what happened on the wards of that institution for female defectives. In each instance, one of the inmates in effect adopted the infant and became its mother; in addition, the entire ward was caught up in activities in behalf of "our baby". New clothes and playthings appeared, and the children were lavished with attention. Indeed, the several wards began to compete with each other in terms of whose baby was developing most rapidly.

More systematic and detailed data on the effects of ecological settings on infant care and development come from a comparative observational study of child rearing in three different environments in Israel: boarding institution. kibbutz, and family (Gewirtz & Gewirtz, 1969). All of the babies were 24 weeks old. The infants living in their own homes were from middle class families in

Jerusalem, and included children raised in two different social positions within the family: *only child*, and *youngest child* with older children already present in the family. In selecting classes of behavior for observation on a time sampling basis, the investigators took an unusual approach: the same types of behavior were observed in both the infants and their caretakers; namely, vocalization and smiling. As might be expected, caretakers spoke and smiled least often in the institutional setting, and most often in the family. But the greatest contrast in caretaker behavior occurred between only and youngest children within the family. For example, the former were exposed to twice as much conversation as the latter, and substantially more smiling as well. The figures for the kibbutz environment were roughly comparable with those for the youngest child in the family, with the qualification that kibbutz children were smiled at more often, and spoken to somewhat less.

Even more instructive are the data on the behavior of the infants themselves. Although the differences are not large, they exactly parallel those found for the caretakers. In other words, the children who vocalized and smiled least often were those brought up in the boarding institution; first borns showed markedly higher rates than youngest children, with kibbutz children comparing favorably with the latter in vocalization, but surpassing them in frequency of smiling. In each instance, the behavior of the children was related not merely to the nature and amount of the stimulation to which they were exposed, but, more particularly, to the extent to which this stimulation was part of an interactive sequence, in which the adult's word or smile was related to a sound or smile emitted by the baby, and vice versa. In other words, once again we have evidence supporting the importance for psychological development of the child's involvement in a reciprocal relationship with other people. But now two additional features are added. First, we observe that the behavior of the caretaker is itself a function of the social setting in which both child and adult are living. Second, the impact of such differences in social arrangement are reflected in the behavior and development of the child himself as early as six months of age. In short, already within the first year of life, development is a function of ecological setting; specifically, the child's behavior becomes isomorphic with the patterns of interaction that are possible in his particular social environment.

We are now in a position to state a second major principle regarding the conditions which foster human development in the early years. We have already noted the critical role played by the child's involvement in a reciprocal system of interaction and attachment. We can now affirm that *the extent to which such a reciprocal system can be developed and maintained depends on the degree to which other encompassing and accompanying social structures provide the place, time, example, and reinforcement to the system and its participants.*

This second principle carries powerful implications for the development of programs and public policy affecting the welfare of young children. But before considering these implications, we do well to examine how the conditions necessary for the child's development change as he becomes older. So far, all the evidence we have examined underscores the importance of the mother-child relationship. What about fathers? Is there any evidence that two parents are better than one?

Indirect evidence bearing on this issue comes from an analysis my students and I have been carrying out on data from a seemingly irrelevant source: experiments carried out with pre-school children in the laboratory, and not involving parents at all. In examining this large body of data, we were concerned not with the problem pursued by the original investigator, but a seemingly incidental matter; namely, who were the experimenters in the study, and what difference did this make to the performance of the children? Although the analysis is not yet complete, several trends are beginning to emerge:

1. Whatever the purpose of the experiment (learning, discrimination, retention, persistence, etc.), children tend to perform better when there are two experimenters present than when there is one.

2. Performance is enhanced if one of these two persons functions as a model (that is, he provides an example of the behavior to be engaged in by the child), and the second acts as a reinforcer (that is, he in some way rewards the child for desired performance; such reward may be nothing more than a nod, smile, "uh-huh", etc.).

3. The child's performance is likely to be somewhat better when the model is of the same sex of the child, and the reinforcer is of the opposite sex.

4. The results are more effective when the reinforcer reinforces not only the child, but the model who is exhibiting the desired behavior.

The implication is clear. Where does the child find himself in a situation in which he is exposed to an adult model of the same sex, and an adult reinforcer of the opposite sex, who reinforces not only the child but the same sex model?

Additional evidence comes from direct studies of the family itself. For example, a growing body of research on the effects of father-absence, both complete and temporary, reveals deleterious effects on the psychological development of the child. Absence is especially critical during the pre-school years, affects boys more than girls, and operates not only directly on the child, but indirectly by influencing the behavior of the mother. Children from father-absent homes, at least initially, are more submissive, dependent, effeminate, and susceptible to group influence, with the later course of development being determined by the character of the group in which the child finds himself. Thus in lower class families, where father-absence is particularly common, the initially passive and dependent boy readily transfers his attachment to the gang where, to earn and keep his place, he must demonstrate his toughness and aggressiveness.[3]

Similar, but not so extreme effects are likely to occur in homes in which the father is present but plays a subordinate role. In a study of the relation between parental role structure and child's behavior (Bronfenbrenner, 1961a, 1961b), it was found that matriarchal families, in which primarily the mother held the power of decision, tended to produce children who "do not take initiative" and "look to others for direction in decision". Similar results were obtained for patriarchal families. In contrast, responsibility and leadership tended to be maximized in a differentiated family structure in which both parents took active but somewhat differing roles in relation to the child. Specifically, children tended to be more responsible in families in which the father was the principal companion and disciplinarian for the boy, and the mother for the girl.

In short, a three-person model including two adults of opposite sex appears to be more effective for socialization than a two-person mother-child model. Although there is a need for additional evidence, it appears likely that, in the beginning, the father functions primarily as a source of support and stand-in for the mother who provides the primary dependency relationship so essential for the child's further development. But already in the pre-school years, the father exerts an important direct influence on the development of the young child, especially when he is a boy.

The fact that the structure most conducive to a child's development turns out to be the family is hardly surprising. The family is, after all, the product of a million years of evolution and should therefore have some survival value for the species.

II. THE PLACE OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES IN CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN SOCIETY

We have seen that the family as a structure is uniquely suited for providing the conditions necessary for the child's development. Hence the question of the status and welfare of children in a given society must be answered, in the first instance, by an inquiry into the status, welfare, and—above all—the functioning of the family *as a child rearing system* in that society. Evidence bearing directly on this question is not easy to come by. We may begin by looking at the data on the number of children growing up in families in which one or both parents is missing (*Profiles of Children*, p. 141). Again, the figure for the nation as a whole (15% in 1970), masks a gross disproportion between non-Whites (40%) and Whites (11%). Although no comparable figures are available for earlier years, some indication is provided by the data on divorce cases involving children; the number of children affected in 1965 is roughly double that for 1953 (*op. cit.*, p. 142.[4]

In incomplete families it is overwhelmingly the father who is the missing parent, but there are indications that mothers are increasingly absent as well.

---

[3] For documentation, see references in Bronfenbrenner, U., 1967.

[4] It is regrettable that, to this writer's knowledge, no systematic studies have been conducted on the affect of divorce on children, particularly when the divorce leads to a remarriage in which the child receives a new parent and, often, new siblings as well. The phenomenon, which is now becoming widespread, not only represents an important human problem posed to thousands of children, but has also considerable theoretical interest in terms of the light it could shed on processes of identification and development of sex role.

For example, over the past two decades, rates of maternal employment have risen markedly so that, by 1969, more than half the mothers of children aged 6 to 17 were in the labor force. An even greater change, however, has occurred among mothers of children below school age, with the rate of employment rising from 13% in 1948 to 30% in 1969. Again, there is a differential by color; the labor force participation rate for mothers of children under 6 is 27% for Whites, and 44% for non-Whites. Finally, only a relatively small proportion (6% in 1965) of the young children of working mothers are enrolled in day care centers; the overwhelming majority are cared for either in their own or someone else's home by a relative or someone else (*Profiles of Children*, p. 62).

One could argue that the foregoing figures on parental absence are misleading, since what counts is not the amount of time the parent spends with the child, but rather the quality of the interaction. Some light on this general issue is shed by an analysis carried out by this writer some years ago of data on child rearing practices in the United States over a twenty-five year period (Bronfenbrenner, 1958). At the time, I interpreted these data as indicating a trend toward increasing permissiveness in all segments of the society. It was only relatively recently that I realized that the same facts could be interpreted more accurately and parsimoniously in another way, for they reflected a decrease not only in discipline but in all spheres of interaction between parents and children. In other words, over recent decades children have been receiving progressively less attention.

A similar conclusion is indicated by the results of cross-cultural studies (Devereux, Bronfenbrenner, & Suci, 1968; Devereux, Bronfenbrenner, & Rodgers, 1969; Bronfenbrenner, 1970). Moreover, as parents, and other adults, have moved out of the lives of children, the vacuum has been filled by the age-segregated peer group. Recently, two of my colleagues (Condry & Siman, in press) have completed a study showing that, at every age and grade level, children today show a greater dependency on their peers than they did a decade ago. A parallel study (Condry and Siman, in press) indicates that such susceptibility to group influence is higher among children from homes in which one or both parents are frequently absent. In addition, "peer oriented" youngsters describe their parents as less affectionate and less firm in discipline. Attachment to age-mates appears to be influenced more by a lack of attention and concern at home than by any positive attraction of the peer group itself. In fact, these children have a rather negative view of their friends and of themselves as well. They are pessimistic about the future, rate lower in responsibility and leadership, and are more likely to engage in such anti-social behavior as lying, teasing other children, "playing hooky", or "doing something illegal".

More recent evidence comes from a dissertation currently being completed by Mr. Michael Siman. Siman did something which, so far as I know, has never been done before. Working with a large sample of teenagers (ages 12 to 17), most of them from middle and lower middle-class homes in New York City, he went to a great deal of trouble to identify and study the actual peer groups in which these adolescents spend so much of their time. There were 41 such peer groups in all. Siman was interested in determining the relative influence of parents versus peers on the behavior of the teenager.

Three classes of behavior were studied:

1. *Socially constructive activities* such as taking part in sports, helping someone who needs help, telling the truth, doing useful work for the neighborhood or community without pay, etc.
2. *Neutral activities* such as listening to records, spending time with the family, etc.
3. *Anti-social activities* such as "playing hooky", "doing something illegal", hurting people, etc.

Siman also obtained information on the extent to which each teenager perceived these activities to be approved or disapproved by his parents and by the members of his peer group. The results are instructive. In the case of boys, for example, he finds that for all three classes of behavior, peers are substantially more influential than parents. In fact, in most cases, once the attitudes of the peer group are taken into account, the attitudes of the parents make no difference whatsoever. The only exceptions are in the area of constructive behavior, where the parent does have some secondary influence in addition to the peer group. But in the neutral, and, especially, the anti-social sphere the peer group is all determining. When it comes to such behaviors as doing something illegal, smoking, or aggression, once the attitude of the peer group is taken into account, the parents' disapproval carries no weight.

What we are seeing here, of course, are the roots of alienation and its milder consequences. The more serious manifestations are reflected in the rising rates of youthful drug abuse, delinquency, and violence documented in charts and tables specially prepared for the White House Conference on Children (*Profiles of Children*, pp. 78, 79, 108, 179, 180). According to these data the proportion of youngsters between the ages of 10 and 18 arrested for drug abuse doubled between 1964 and 1968; since 1963, juvenile delinquency has been increasing at a faster rate than the juvenile population; over half the crimes involve vandalism, theft, or breaking and entry; and, if the present trends continue, one out of every nine youngsters will appear in juvenile court before age 18. These figures index only detected and prosecuted offenses. How high must they run before we acknowledge that they reflect deep and pervasive problems in the treatment of children and youth in our society?

What accounts for the growing alienation of children and youth in American society? Why is it that the parents have so little influence? There are those who are quick to put the blame on the parents themselves, charging them with willful neglect and inadequate discipline. But to take this view is to disregard the social context in which families live, and thereby to do injustice to parents as human beings. Although there is no systematic evidence on the question, there are grounds for believing that parents today, far from not caring about their children, are more worried about them than they have ever been in the course of recent history. The crux of the problem, as indicated by Siman's data, is that many parents have become powerless as forces in the lives of their children. The nature of the problem has been spelled out in a report prepared for the White House Conference on Children by a committee under the chairmanship of the Author (Report of Forum 15, 1970). The following excerpts convey the thrust of the argument:

In today's world parents find themselves at the mercy of a society which imposes pressures and priorities that allow neither time nor place for meaningful activities and relations between children and adults, which downgrade the role of parents and the functions or parenthood, and which prevent the parent from doing things he wants to do as a guide, friend, and companion to his children.

The frustrations are greatest for the family of poverty where the capacity for human response is crippled by hunger, cold, filth, sickness, and despair. No parent who spends his days in search of menial work, and his nights in keeping the rats away from the crib can be expected to find the time—let alone the heart—to engage in constructive activities with his children or serve as a stable source of love and discipline. The fact that some beleaguered parents manage to do so is a tribute to them, but not to the society in which they live.

For families who can get along, the rats are gone, but the rat race remains. The demands of a job, or often two jobs, that claim mealtimes, evenings, and weekends as well as days; the trips and moves necessary to get ahead or simply hold one's own; the ever increasing time spent in commuting, parties, evenings out, social and community obligations—all the things one has to do to meet so-called primary responsibilities—produce a situation in which a child often spends more time with a passive babysitter than a participating parent.

And even when the parent is at home, a compelling force cuts off communication and response among the family members. Although television could, if used creatively, enrich the activities of children and families, it now only undermines them. Like the sorcerer of old, the television set casts its magic spell, freezing speech and action and turning the living into silent statues so long as the enchantment lasts. The primary danger of the television screen lies not so much in the behavior it produces as the behavior it prevents—the talks, the games, the family festivities and arguments through which much of the child's learning takes place and his character is formed. Turning on the television set can turn off the process that transforms children into people.

In our modern way of life, children are deprived not only of parents but of people in general. A host of factors conspire to isolate children from the rest of society. The fragmentation of the extended family, the separation of residential and business areas, the disappearance of neighborhoods, zoning ordinances, occupational mobility, child labor laws, the abolishment of the apprentice system, consolidated schools, television, separate patterns of social life for different age groups, the working mother, the delegation of child care to specialists—all these manifestations of progress operate to decrease opportunity and incentive

for meaningful contact between children and persons older, or younger, than themselves.

And here we confront a fundamental and disturbing fact: *Children need people in order to become human.* The fact is fundamental because it is firmly grounded both in scientific research and in human experience. It is disturbing because the isolation of children from adults simultaneously threatens the growth of the individual and the survival of the society. The young cannot pull themselves up by their own bootstraps. It is primarily through observing, playing, and working with others older and younger than himself that a child discovers both what he can do and who he can become—that he develops both his ability and his identity. It is primarily through exposure and interaction with adults and children of different ages that a child acquires new interests and skills and learns the meaning of tolerance, cooperation, and compassion. Hence to relegate children to a word of their own is to deprive them of their humanity, and ourselves as well.

Yet, this is what is happening in America today. *We are experiencing a breakdown in the process of making human beings human.* By isolating our children from the rest of society, we abandon them to a world devoid of adults and ruled by the destructive impulses and compelling pressures both of the age-segregated peer group and the aggressive and exploitive television screen. By setting our priorities elsewhere and putting children and families last, by claiming one set of values while pursuing another, we leave our children bereft of standards and support and our own lives impoverished and corrupted.

This reversal of priorities, which amounts to a betrayal of our children, underlies the growing disillusionment and alienation among young people in all segments of American society. Those who grew up in settings where children and families still counted are able to react to their frustration in positive ways—through constructive protest, participation, and public service. Those who come from circumstances in which the family could not function, be it in slum or suburb, can only strike out against an environment they have experienced as indifferent, callous, cruel, and unresponsive. We do not condone the destruction and violence manifested by young people in widely disparate sections of our society; we merely point to the roots of a process which, if not reversed, . . . can have only one result: the far more rapid and pervasive growth of alienation, apathy, drugs, delinquency, and violence among the young, and not so young, in all segments of our national life. We face the prospect of a society which resents its own children and fears its youth.

. . . What is needed is a change in our patterns of living which will once again bring people back into the lives of children and children back into the lives of people.

Stripped of its rhetoric, the foregoing passage can be seen as spelling out the consequence of a breakdown in social process at two levels: first a failure in the primary system of reciprocal interaction provided by the family; second, a "withering away" of the support systems in the larger society that in fact enable the family to function. Since the latter are really antecedent to the former, the development of programs and policies must focus, in the first instance, on strategies that will rebuild and revitalize the social context which families require for their effective function. It is to this problem that we turn in the final section of the paper.

III. POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

In the light of the foregoing analysis, we must seek to develop policies and programs which are in accord with the following principles:

1. To be maximally effective, programs must be designed to further the development of children *and families.* Like Project Head Start, they must seek to improve not just the environment of the child, but the environment of those who can and will have the most impact on his development.

2. In keeping with the foregoing principle, it is essential that programs be so designed as to enhance rather than destroy the integrity of families. For example, admission requirements should not discriminate against single-parent families, or families in which the parent works only part-time.

3. Programs should be designed in such a way as to maximize the involvement in activities with children of parents, neighbors, older children, and all those persons who make up the enduring social environment of the child.

4. Programs must be so designed as to enhance the integrity of neighborhood and community in which the families of the children live and work.

5. Programs cannot be limited to the period of early childhood. The most impressive progress during the first years of life can be undone by destructive environment in the school or in the pear group.

6. Consistent with the foregoing principle, of crucial importance for the welfare and development of school age children is the re-integration of schools into the life of the community. Above all, we must reverse the present trend toward the construction and administration of schools as isolated compounds divorced from the rest of the community. Many such schools are becoming quasi-penal institutions in which teachers are increasingly forced to function as detectives and guards with pupils being treated as suspects or prisoners for whom liberty is a special privilege.

7. As a necessary step to the re-integration of schools and children into the community, programs should be encouraged which involves members of the community in the school program, and children in the activities of the community. Such involvement should take the form not merely of duties and chores, but of genuine responsibilities involving consequential decisions for which the young person is held accountable.

8. Important for children of all ages is the development of programs which involve older children in genuine responsibility for the care of the young. For this reason, it is desirable to locate day care and pre-school programs such as Head Start Centers, in or near schools and to integrate such programs into the regular school curriculum as a means of preparing young people for parenthood and for awareness of the needs of young children and their families.

9. Programs should provide for the active involvement of all the institutions in the community. This includes not only those that have direct and acknowledged impact on children and families—such as school boards, welfare departments, recreation and police departments, etc.—but also other institutions whose impact on family life is often unrecognized but profound. This includes local businesses and industries, local and regional planning commissions, park commissions, architects, etc.

There are several areas of special significance in which these principles must be applied:

Day Care. Day care is coming to America. The question is: what kind? Shall we, in response to external pressures to "put people to work", or for personal considerations of convenience, allow a pattern to develop in which the care of young children is delegated to specialists, thus further separating the child from his family and reducing the family's and the community's feeling of responsibility for their children? Or, shall our modern day care be so designed as to reinvolve and strengthen the family as the primary and proper agent for the process of making human beings human?

The answers to these questions depend on the extent to which day care programs are so located and so organized as to encourage rather than to discourage the involvement of parents and other non-professionals in the development and operation of the program both at the center and in the home. Like Project Head Start, day care programs can have no lasting constructive impact on the development of the child unless they affect not only the child himself but the people who constitute his enduring day-to-day environment in the family, neighborhood, and community. This means not only that parents must play an active part in the planning and administration of day care programs, but that they must also actively particiapte in the activities of the program as volunteers and aides. It means that the program cannot be confined to the center, but must reach out into the home and the community so that the whole neighborhood is caught up in activities in behalf of its children. From this point of view, we need to experiment in location of day care centers in places that are within reach of the significant people in the child's life. For some families this means neighborhood centers; for others, centers at the place of work. A great deal of variation and innovation will be required to find the appropriate solutions for different groups in different settings.

Availability of part-time employment. Clearly, a key factor in the success of an effective day care program is the availability of the mother for involvement in the program both at the center and in the home. More generally, the research evidence we have reviewed strongly suggests that the ideal arrangement for the development of the young child is one in which his mother is free to work part-time. As we have seen, the establishment of an effective reciprocal relationship does require a substantial amount of time, probably more than can easily be combined with full time work outside the home. But, in order to be able to function

effectively as a parent, the mother must also have the opportunity of being a total person. Moreover, as we have noted, the young child does not require care by the same person all the time, and indeed profits from the intercession of others, notably his father. It was in the light of these considerations that the aforementioned Report to the White House Conference urged business, industry, and government as employer to increase the number and status of part-time positions, including home-based part-time employment opportunities. In addition the Report recommended that state legislatures enact a "Fair Part-Time Employment Practices Act", which would prohibit discrimination in job opportunity, rate of pay, fringe benefits, and status for parents who sought or engaged in part-time employment.

Modification of work schedules and obligations. Along the same line, the Report also urged employers to re-examine and modify present policies and practices of the organization as they affected family life, especially in the following areas: out of town, weekend and overnight obligations; frequency and timing of geographical moves; flexibility of work schedule; leave and rest privileges for maternal and child care; and job related social obligations.

Reacquainting children with adults as participants in the world of work. One of the most significant effects of age-segregation in our society has been the isolation of children from the world of work. Whereas in the past children not only saw what their parents did for a living but even shared substantially in the task, many children nowadays have only a vague notion of the nature of the parent's job, and have had little or no opportunity to observe the parent, or for that matter any other adult, when he is fully engaged in his work. Although there is no systematic research evidence on this subject, it appears likely that the absence of such exposure contributes significantly to the growing alienation among the children and youth that we have already described. Yet, as experience in other modern urban societies indicates, such isolation of children from adults in the world of work is not inevitable, since it may be countered by creative social innovations. Perhaps the most imaginative and pervasive of these is the pattern universally employed in the Soviet Union (Bronfenbrenner, 1970), in which a place of work—such as a shop in a factory, an office, institute, or business enterprise—adopts a group of children as their "wards." The children's group is typically a school classroom, but also includes nurseries, hospital wards, or any other setting in which children are dealt with collectively. The workers not only visit the children's group wherever it may be, but also invite the youngsters to the place of work in order to familiarize them with the nature of their activities and with themselves as people. The aim is not vocational education, but rather acquaintance with adults as participants in the work of the society.

There seems to be nothing in such an approach that would be incompatible with the values and aims of our own society, and this writer has urged its adaptation to the American scene. Acting on this suggestion, Dr. David Goslin of the Russell Sage Foundation persuaded one of America's great newspapers, the *Detroit Free Press*, to participate in an unusual experiment as a prelude to the White House Conference on Children. When it was over, two groups of twelve-year-old children, one from a slum area, the other predominantly middle class, had spent six to seven hours a day for three days in virtually every department of the newspaper, not just observing, but actively participating in the department's activities. There were boys and girls in the press room, the city room, the composing room, the advertising department, and the dispatch department. The employees of the *Free Press* entered into the experiment with serious misgivings. "This is a busy place; we have a newspaper to get out every day. What are those kids going to do, just sit around?" What actually happened is recorded in a documentary film that was made of the experiment.[5] The children were not bored; nor were the adults. And the paper did get out every day. Here are some of the spontaneous comments recorded in the film.

"Adults should talk more with children and pay more attention to them instead of leaving them in the dark—because you can't really get to know much about each other unless you talk."—Gian, age 11

"It's sad to see her leaving. In three days she became part of the group up there."—Tony, age 53

"This is a place to meet, a way to understand people."—Morgan, age 11

"It's been fun, it really has . . . I talked to him about having him out to our house to meet my sons and visit with us."—Joe, age 35

---

[5] "A Place to Meet, a Way to Understand". New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1970.

"If every kid in Detroit and all around the United States got to do this—I don't think there would be so many problems in the world."—Collette, age 11

Of course, the adults at work whom the children got to know at the *Detroit Free Press* were not their own parents. Remarking on this fact, a group of leading businessmen and industrialists at a conference convened by the Johnson Foundation in follow-up of the White House recommendations came up with a modification which they proposed to try in their own companies; namely, having the employees invite their own children to spend an extended period at the parent's place of work. At first, the notion was that the parents would take time off, so that they could be free to be with their children, but one of the participants correctly pointed out that this would defeat the entire purpose of the undertaking, which was to enable children to see their parents engaged in responsible and demanding tasks.

It should be clear that if these kinds of innovations are to accomplish their objective, they cannot be confined to a single experience, even of three days, but must be continued, at intermittent intervals, over an extended period of time. Nor is it yet established what the effect of such innovations will be on the behavior and development of children. Indeed we do not even know whether American society will find such innovations acceptable and feasible. But there is some hope that experiments of this kind will be tired. As this is being written the *Detroit Free Press* film has just become available for distribution to the public, and already the word has come back that a variety of innovations are being initiated. In one community, for example, the city government has decided to "adopt" groups of children in order to acquaint them with the people and activities involved in that enterprise. In another area, advertisements have been placed in the local newspaper asking persons engaged in a wide variety of occupations (e.g. carpenter, insurance salesman, garage mechanic, social worker, etc.) whether they would be willing to have one child accompany them as they go through the day's work. As such innovations are introduced, they should be evaluated not only in terms of their impact on the child, but also on the adult who, perhaps for the first time, is being asked to relate to a young child in the context of his life's occupation.

The involvement of children in genuine responsibilities. If the child is to become a responsible person, he must not only be exposed to adults engaged in demanding tasks, but himself, from early on, begin to participate in such activities. In the perspective of cross-cultural research, one of the characteristics that emerges most saliently for our nation is what Nicholas Hobbs has called "the inutility of childhood" in American society. To quote again from the White House Report:

Our children are not entrusted with any real responsibilities in their family, neighborhood, or community. Little that they do really matters. When they do participate, it is in some inconsequential undertaking. They are given duties rather than responsibilities; that is, the ends and means have been determined by someone else, and their job is to fulfill an assignment involving little judgment, decision making, or risk. The latter remain within the purvey of supervising adults. Although this policy is deemed to serve the interest of the children themselves by protecting them from burdens beyond their years, there is reason to believe that it has been carried too far in contemporary American society and has contributed to the alienation and alleged incapacity of young people to deal constructively with personal and social problems. The evidence indicates that children acquire the capacity to cope with difficult situations when they have been given opportunity to take on consequential responsibilities in relation to others, *and are held accountable for them.*

While training for responsibility by giving responsibility clearly begins in the family, the institution which is probably done the most to keep children insulated from challenging social tasks is the American school system. For historical reasons rooted in the separation of church and state, this system has been isolated from responsible social concern both substantively and spatially. In terms of content, education in America, when viewed from a cross-cultural perspective, seems peculiarly one-sided; it emphasizes subject matter to the exclusion of another molar aspect of the child's development. The neglect of this second area is reflected by the absence of any generally accepted term for it in our educational vocabulary. What the Germans call *Erzichung*, the Russians *vesuitanie*, and the French *education* has no common counterpart in English. Perhaps the best equivalents are "upbringing" or "character education"—terms which, to the extent that they have any meaning to us at all, sound pattern within the school itself.

Here it is groups of children who do the "adopting." Thus each class takes on responsibility for the care of a group of children at a lower grade level. For example, a third grade class "adopts" a first grade class in the same school, or a kindergarten in the immediate neighborhood. The older children escort the younger ones to the school or center, play with them on the playground, teach them new games, read to them, help them learn. Moreover, the manner in which they fulfill this civic responsibility enters into the evaluation of their school performance as a regular part of the curriculum.

Again, there is nothing in this pattern which would be incompatible with the values and objectives of our own society. Indeed, some of its elements are already present in the cross-age tutoring programs which have begun to spring up around the country (Cloward, 1967; National Commission on Resources for Youth, Inc., 1969; Parke, 1969). But here again the focus tends to be on the development of skills and subject matter rather than concern for the total child as an individual and a member of his own and the larger community.

One way of translating this broader concept in concrete terms would be to establish in the school, beginning even at the elementary level, what might be called functional courses in human development. These would be distinguished in a number of important ways from courses or units on "family life", as they are now taught in the junior high school, chiefly for girls who do not plan to go on to college. The material is typically presented in vicarious form; that is, through reading, discussion, or at most, through role playing, rather than actual role taking. In contrast, the approach being proposed here would have as its core responsible and active concern for the lives of young children and their families. Such an experience could be facilitated by locating day care centers and Head Start Programs in or near schools, so that they could be utilized as an integral part of the curriculum. The older children would be working with the younger ones on a regular basis. In addition they would escort the little ones to and from school or center, and, perhaps, spend some time with them out of school. In this way, they would have an opportunity to become acquainted with the younger children's families, and the circumstances in which they live. This in turn would provide a vitalizing context for the study of services and facilities available to children and families in the community, such as health care, social services, recreation facilities, and of course, the schools themselves. Obviously, the scope of responsibility would increase with the age of the child, but throughout there would have to be adequate supervision and clear delineation of the limits of responsibility carried by older children in relation to the young.

The same pattern of responsible involvement could also be applied in relation to other groups such as the aged, the sick, the disadvantaged, and those living alone.

Finally, within a broader perspective, the children should be given an active part in defining what the problems are in their school and their community, and what their responsibility is or should become in contributing to a solution to these problems. Within the school, this implies greater involvement of children in the formulation and enforcement of codes of behavior and in the planning and development of activities of the classroom, so that the burden of maintaining discipline does not fall solely or even primarily on the shoulders of the teacher, who would then be left free to perform the primary function of expanding the children's horizon and range of competence. Outside the school, the pupils should be encouraged to take on projects, both as individuals and groups, dealing with concrete problems, which they themseelves have helped to identify—for example, "cleaning up the environment", service projects, etc. In each instance young people should work in cooperation with appropriate persons and agents in the community not as subordinates but active collaborators who can contribute ideas as well as service.

Neighborhoods and communities as support systems. It has been the central thesis of this paper that the power of parents, and other adults to function as constructive forces in the lives of children depends in substantial measure on the degree to which the surrounding community provides the place, time, example, and encouragement for persons to engage in activities with the young. This, in turn, implies the existence, and, where need be, the establishment in the community of institutions which address themselves primarily to these concerns. It is significant that, at the present time, few such institutions do in fact exist. As matters now stand, the needs of children are parceled out among a hopeless confusion of agencies with diverse objectives, conflicting jurisdictions, and imperfect channels of communication. The school, the health department, churches,

welfare services, youth organizations, the medical profession, libraries, the police, recreation programs—all of these see the children and parents of the community at one time or another, but not one of them is concerned with the total pattern of life for children and families in the community. If such child and family oriented institutions and activities were to be established, what might they be like? We conclude this paper with an attempt to envision some of the structures and operations with which we might experiment in order to arrive at viable solutions:

1. *Commission for Children and Families.* Such a Commission, established at the community or neighborhood level, would have as its initial charge finding out what the community is doing, or not doing, for its children and their families. The Commission would examine the adequacy of existing programs such as maternal and child health services, day care facilities, and recreational opportunities. It would also investigate what places and people are available to children when they are not in school, what opportunities they have for play, challenging activities, or useful work, and to whom they can turn for guidance or assistance. The Commission would also assess the existing and needed resources in the community that provide families with opportunities for learning, living, and leisure that involve common activity across levels of age, ability, knowledge, and skill.

In order to accomplish its task, the Commission would need to include representatives of the major institutions concerned with children and families, as well as other segments of community life such as business, industry, and labor. Especially important is inclusion on the Commission of teenagers and older children who can speak directly from their own experiences. The Commission would be expected to report its findings and recommendations to appropriate executive bodies and to the public at large through mass media. After completing the initial assessment phase, the Commission would assume continued responsibility for developing and monitoring programs to implement its recommendations.

2. *Neighborhood Family Centers.* Families are strengthened through association with each other in common activities and responsibilities. For this to occur, there must be places where families can meet in order to work and play together. The Neighborhood Family Center is such a place. Located in the school, church, or other community building, it provides a focal point for leisure and learning and community problem solving to all family members. The Center offers facilities for games and creative activities that could be engaged in by persons of all ages with space for those who prefer merely to "watch the fun." To eliminate fragmentation of services, the Center can also serve as the local "one door" entry point for obtaining family services in the areas of health, child care, legal aid, welfare, etc. The Center differs from the traditional community center in emphasizing cross-age rather than age-segregated activities.

3. *Community and Neighborhood Projects.* Community organizations should be encouraged to provide a variety of activities which enable different generations to have contact and become a significance part of each other's lives. Through community sponsored projects, individuals of all ages can grow in their appreciation of each other as they learn to give to one another through a sharing of their talents and skills. The growing interest in ecology—cleaning up the environment—provides an excellent focus for such common endeavors, since it requires a variety of knowledges, skills, and services. Concern for the aged, the sick, and the lonely provide similar challenges. In addition to service opportunities, there is the need for recreational facilities and programs in which cross-age activities can take place (for example, family camps, fairs, games, picnics, etc.).

4. *Participation of Youth in Local Policy Bodies.* In keeping with the principle that young people become responsible by being given and held accountable for responsibilities that really matter, every community organization having jurisdiction over activities affecting children and youth should include some teenagers and older children as voting members. This would include such organizations as school boards, welfare commissions, recreation commissions, and hospital boards.

5. *Community and Neighborhood Planning.* Much of what happens to children and families in a community is determined by the ecology of the neighborhood in which the family lives. The implication of this principle for our own times is illustrated in a recent research report on the effect of the so-called "new towns" on the lives of children. It is perhaps characteristic that the question was raised not within our own society but in West Germany. The study compared the actions

of children living in 18 new "model communities" with those from youngsters living is older German cities. The research was conducted by the Urban and Planning Institute in Nuremberg in collaboration with the Institute of Psychology at the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg. As of this writing, copies of the technical report are not yet available in this country; the following are excerpts from a special bulletin to the *New York Times* (May 9, 1971):

In the new towns of West Germany, amid soaring rectangular shapes of apartment houses with shaded walks, big lawns and fenced-in play areas, the children for whom much of this has been designed apparently feel isolated, regimented and bored . . .

The study finds that the children gauge their freedom not by the extent of open areas around them, but by the liberty they have to be among people and things that excite them and fire their imaginations . . .

Children in the older cities seemed enthusiastic about their surroundings, painting a great amount of detail into a variety of things they found existing around them, according to those who interpreted their art

The children in the model communities often painted what were considered despairing pictures of the world the adults had fashioned for them, depicting an uninviting, concrete fortress of cleanliness and order and boredom.

The implications of the research are self evident. In the planning and design of new communities, housing projects, and urban renewal, the planners, both public and private, need to give explicit consideration to the kind of world that is being created for the children who will be growing up in these settings. Particular attention should be given to the opportunities which the environment presents or precludes for involvement of children with persons both older and younger than themselves. Among the specific factors to be considered are the location of shops and businesses where children could have contact with adults at work, recreational and day care facilities readily accessible to parents as well as children, provision for a Family Neighborhood Center and family oriented facilities and services, availability of public transportation, and, perhaps most important of all, places to walk, sit, and talk in common company.

The foregoing proposals are not comprehensive or complete. They are simply intended to point the way to a better world for children and those responsible for their care.

References

Bell, R. Q. A reinterpretation of the direction of effects in studies of socialization. *Psychological Review*, 1968, 75, 81–95.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Socialization and social class through time and space. In E. E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, and E. Hartley (Eds.), *Readings in Social Psychology*, 3rd edition. New York: Holt, 1958, 400–425.

———, The changing American child—a speculative analysis. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 1961, 7, 73–84. (a)

———. Toward a theoretical model for the analysis of child relationships in the social context. In J. C. Glidewell (Ed.), *Parental Attitudes and Child Behavior*. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1961, 96–109. (b)

———. The psychological costs of quality and equality in education. *Child Development*, 1967, *38*, 909–925.

———. When is infant stimulation effective? In D. C. Glass (Ed.), *Environmental Influence*. New York: Rockefeller University Press, 1968, 251–257.

———. *Two Worlds of Childhood*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1970.

Caldwell, B. M., Hersher, L., Lipton, E. L., Richmond, J. B., Stern, G. A., Eddy, E., Drachman, R., & Rothman, A. Mother-infant interaction in monomatric and polymatric families. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 1963, *33*, 653–664.

Cloward, R. D. Studies in tutoring. *Journal of Experimental Education*, Fall 1967, *36*, 14–25.

Condry, J. C. & Siman, M. A. Characteristics of peer- and adult-oriented children. Unpublished manuscript, Cornell University, 1968.

———. An experimental study of adult versus peer orientation. Unpublished manuscript, Cornell University, 1968.

Devereux, E. C., Bronfenbrenner, U., & Rodgers, R. R. Child rearing in England and the United States: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, May 1969, 31, 257–270.

Devereux, E. C., Bronfenbrenner, U., & Suci., G. J. Patterns of parent behavior in America and West Germany: A cross-national comparison. *International Social Science Journal*, 1962, *XIV*, 488–506.

Gardner, J. & Gardner, H. A note on selective imitation by a six-week-old infant. *Child Development*, 1970, *41*, 1209–1213.
Gewirtz, H. B. & Gewirtz, J. L. Caretaking settings, background events and behavior differences in four Israeli child rearing environments: Some preliminary trends. In B. M. Foss (Ed.) *Determinants of Behavior*, Vol. IV. London: Methuen, 1969, 229–295.
Jarus, A., Marcus, J., Oren, J., & Rapaport, Ch. *Children and Families in Israel.* New York: Gordon and Breach, 1970.
Kagan, J. On cultural deprivation. In D. C. Glass (Ed.), *Environmental Influences.* New York: Rockefeller University Press, 1968, 211–250.
Moss, H. A. Sex, age, and state as determinants of mother-infant interaction. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 1967, *13*, 19–36.
National Commission on Resources for Youth, Inc. *Youth tutoring youth—it worked.* A final report, January 31, 1969. 36 West 44th Street, New York, New York 10036.
New York Times, May 9, 1971.
Palmer, F. H. & Rees, N. H. Concept training in two-year-old: Procedure and results. Paper presented at the Biannual meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, March 27, 1969, Santa Monica, California.
Parke, B. K. Towards a new rationale for cross-age tutoring. Unpublished manuscript, Cornell University, November 1969.
Profiles of Children. Washington, D.C.: White House Conference on Children. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970.
Report of Forum 15. Washington, D.C.: White House Conference on Children. December, 1970.
Rheingold, H. L. The social and socializing infant. In D. A. Goslin, *Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research*, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969, 779–790.
Rheingold, H. L., Gewirtz, J. L., & Ross, H. W. Social conditioning of vocalization in the infant. *Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology*, 1959, *2*, 68–73.
Skeels, H. M. Adult status of children with contrasting early life experiences. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 1966, *31*, Serial #105.
Skeels, H. M. & Dye, H. B. A study of the effects of differential stimulation on mentally retarded children *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Association on Mental Defficiency*, 1939, *44*, 114–136.
Skeels, H. M., Updegraff, R., Wellman, B. L., & Williams, H. M. A study of environmental stimulation: An orphanage pre-school project. *University of Iowa Studies in Child Welfare*, 1930, *15*, #4.
Tulkin, S. R. & Cohler, B. J. Child rearing attitudes on mother-child interaction among middle and working class families. Paper presented at the 1971 Meeting of the Socieay for Research in Child Development.
Tulkin, S. R. & Kagan, J. Mother-child interaction: Social class differences in the first year of life. *Proceedings of the 78th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association*, 1970, 261–262.

Senator MONDALE. We stand in recess until tomorrow morning at 10 a.m.

(Whereupon, at 11:45 a.m., the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene at 10 a.m., Tuesday, April 27, 1971).

67-582 O—71——5

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN—CHILD DEVELOPMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

TUESDAY, APRIL 27, 1971

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH
OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to recess, in room 4232, New Senate Office Building, Senator Walter F. Mondale (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Mondale and Taft.

Staff members present: A. Sidney Johnson III, professional staff member; and John K. Scales, minority counsel.

Senator MONDALE. We are very pleased to have a most impressive panel of witnesses this morning; Dr. Jerome Kagan is our first witness. He is the Chairman of the White House Conference Forum on Developmental Day-Care Services. I would like Dr. Kagan to come to the witness table.

There is one thing I should have mentioned yesterday. Senator Taft's family numbers 10 children and he is a built-in expert on this question. We plan to call on him frequently.

At this time I will submit for the record a letter from Senator Kennedy.

(The letter referred to follows:)

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., April 26, 1971.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Children and Youth,
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Although I regret that I am unable to be with you this morning I am pleased with this opportunity to express my concern about the needs of our nation's children.

My long-standing interest in the problems and welfare of young children has stemmed from a firm belief in working vigorously to produce community efforts that properly nurture our most important national resources—our children.

It is fitting, therefore, that the Senate through the Subcommittee on Children and Youth is devoting its full attention and interest toward the concerns of our youth. I am gratified to see you, Mr. Chairman, assume the responsibility for guiding the Senate through this vitally important review of children's needs and interests.

I am also happy to have this opportunity to welcome Dr. Jerome Kagan to the opening series in these hearings. As a foremost authority in childhood development and a Harvard professor of Child Psychology, Dr. Kagan is expertly qualified to present this committee with valuable information about the requirements for adequate childhood development.

Last year during the White House Conference on Children, I was impressed with the pleas made by members of the Massachusetts delegation to that confer-

ence. Their principal attention was aimed at establishing the right of children to obtain a full share in the resources planned for improving our national welfare. They made me know, in terms that I have heard repeated many times, that our society's dependence on children for hope in the future has never been more tenuous. Despite our claim for full interest in the affairs of our young too often, as parents, our own selfish interest consumes such an enormous part of our energies that our children are ignored or neglected.

And so, it is vitally significant that under your very able direction, Mr. Chairman, we in the Senate have begun to fulfill our commitment to the improvement of guarantees for proper child welfare.

We know that in America, today, proper childhood development is not the highest priority concern in our national policies and programs. Across this nation the neglect of our children engenders feelings of dismay and disinterest because parents do not carry the vigil for child care the way we pursue our struggle for material success.

We are excited and agitated more by the failures of our autos than by the fragmentation of our families. We spend more money on packaged foods for our pets than on *school lunches* for our children. And our sales of alcoholic beverages are more than 4 times the amount we spend on milk.

For the family living in poverty the pressures of deprivation add up to a staggering toll of frustration and loss of initiative. But, even in the families that can buy health and clothing, food and education, too often there is no warmth or guidance, strength or discipline.

Life in America moves too fast and in too many directions—with the result that children are denied the compassionate attachment that comes from just being with people. With television as a sitter our children are pacified into indifference and unconcern. The pressures in our modern society on every parent are shifting. But the demands on our children are also mounting.

I am convinced that we need to take a long hard look at the provisions made by our national institutions for childcare. You are making a proper start in that direction with these hearings.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the goal for us on this committee is all too clear. We must seek to establish a national commitment that recognizes the welfare of our children as a primary objective for all our institutions.

With sincere regards.

EDWARD M. KENNEDY.

Senator MONDALE. Dr. Kagan, we are most pleased to have you with us this morning. We are most impressed by your work and the work of your committee at the White House Conference and for the tremendous contribution you continue to make in this field.

If you will proceed?

STATEMENT OF DR. JEROME KAGAN, CHAIRMAN, WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE FORUM ON "DEVELOPMENTAL DAY-CARE SERVICES FOR CHILDREN"

Dr. KAGAN. Mr. Chairman, Senator Taft, I appreciate the opportunity to speak before this committee.

I want to accomplish two things in my comments this morning. I want to talk about the psychological needs of children in a general way, and then consider the implications of these earlier comments for day care in particular.

Two basic assumptions must always be kept in mind when one is trying to implement programs for children. The first one is this: Excluding the physical requirements of a child, all children need proteins and vitamins, the best treatment for a child by his parents, by his peers, or by a day-care center is always dependent on the cultural demands that will be made upon him.

There is no fixed way to treat a child so that he will always turn out to have the best set of personality characteristics. Let me give you some examples.

Among the Eskimos of Hudson Bay, for example, no child is physically punished for being aggressive and aggression is always treated with "shame." By the time children are 7 years of age one rarely sees anger or aggressive behavior. These children are well socialized.

They don't show migraine headaches, psychosomatic symptoms, or any of the problems that would occur if anger and aggression were so seriously frowned upon in America. However, if they were brought to the United States they might begin to show these symptoms because they would see aggression in other children.

If we took an American child to an Utku igloo he would be poorly adapted and if we brought an Utku child to Washington he would be maladjusted. In other words, the Eskimo mother does for her child what is best for him in that cultural context.

Let me give you one more example. I consult with an important project on malnutrition and mental development in Guatemala. In these Indian villages it is rare for a parent to punish a child; yet children are as well socialized as any middle-class American child.

The reason is that there is no diversity. As long as all people in the community have the same set of values and one is not exposed to a different set, adults do not have to punish the child.

One cannot do this in the United States because the child is exposed to so many different sets of values and behaviors one must adopt a different set of socialization practices.

If one accepts this argument, one asks first what kind of adolescents Americans want; and then stipulates the kind of treatment they should have in the first 10 years of life.

Incidentally, this is one reason why we cannot look at another culture, Russia or Israel, and adopt practices they use and assume they will have the same effect in the United States that they do in their own culture.

Let me be a prophet for a moment and suggest that Americans will continue to value the following traits, even though all cultures do not value these attributes. We will probably continue to value individualism; we probably will continue to value the ability of a young man or young woman to take a leadership role and to take responsibility for others.

We will probably continue to value the feeling that one is in control of the environment and not a pawn at the hands of forces over which one has no control.

Finally, we will continue to value self-esteem, the feeling that one is a valuable person, valued by others.

If these four psychological traits continue to be valued by our culture, then we can make recommendations about procedures that will optimize these goals.

Unfortunately, man loves to rank order, people, and objects into categories of good, better, and best. It is impossible to find communities, no matter how small, where some people don't regard themselves as less adequate, less competent, and less "good" than others.

In the United States there is always, a positive relationship between social class; by that I mean income and education, and how well or does on intellectual tests.

That is probably the most reliable fact psychology has. The frightening thing is that in communities with a restricted range of social class, and I am thinking here of Indian communities in Guatemala where to be middle class means that one has two machetes rather than one, or a separate place to cook, the children of so-called advantaged families do better on tests of memory and tests of language.

This is not only a function of nutrition, and disease, it is also a function of what happens to children in families who believe they have more of the resources of the community. We should never forget this fact because the implication is that whatever we do at a Federal, State, or local level, one must always take into account the total sociological context in which that child lives.

If for this hour we can agree on the dimensions that Americans will value then there are some experiences that all children should probably have. I want to address my comments to the period of infancy and the period of preschool. The infant from birth to 2 years has special requirements that are not relevent for a child of three.

First, every human infant shall have continuity of care by a limited number of people. The caretaker does not have to be the biological mother, but the child will not develop optimally, if he is cared for by eight, nine, or 10 different people over the course of a week or a month. Hence day-care centers should have firm rules restricting the number of people who can care for a child in the first 2 years of life.

Second, the child needs predictability. Predictability is more important than the amount of stimulation an infant receives.

Let me tell you of an interesting finding. A psychologist at Boston University spent 2 years in eastern Holland in a totally middle-class community. In this small area all pediatricians tell mothers that they are to put the child during the first 10 months of life in a room, not to stimulate him, talk to him, or show him mobiles, and feed him every 4 hours.

These are the kinds of conditions some psychologists would assume would produce a very disturbed child. It turns out that at age 5 one cannot tell him from a Washington, Cambridge, or New York 5-year-old. He seems perfectly fine. Although the first 10 months appears to be a deprived situation it is predictable. That child knows what is going to happen, he knows when he will be fed, he knows he will be cleaned. If he was left in that room for 3 years he might be disturbed, but parents have a certain wisdom and know that once the child begins to stand and talk it is time to bring him into the adult environment.

Since our culture values verbal ability, spontaneity, and social responsiveness, it is important that during the first 2 years of life the child begins to acquire these traits. For reasons we don't quite understand, poor parents—color is not a factor here—do not enter into long periods of vocal interchange and long periods of reciprocal play with their infants as often and as frequently as middle-class parents. As a result, when the child reaches the first or second birthday, he tends to be less vocal and less socially responsive.

In and of itself that is not a negative trait. But our culture values a vocal, verbal, socially responsive child. Therefore, if these children are put in group-care situations it is important that the curricula arrange the environment to promote these attributes.

Now, let me speak about the preschool situation. First, the preschool child must believe that he is valued by some adult.

Normally, in a family situation, even a family situation with six children, it is impossible for the child not to know that his parents are aware of him, and, therefore, that need is always met in a family context.

But in a day-care situation with 40 or 50 3-year-olds, it is not impossible for a 3-year-old child to come to the conclusion that no one knows he is there; no one knows he exists. Everything we know about personality development suggests this situation is inimical to good psychological growth.

Second, every child has to believe that if he begins a task or a problem he will achieve some success. It is important, therefore, that parents, family day-care parents, natural parents, or caretakers in a day-care center, be acutely sensitive to the importance of encouraging the child, and persuading him that he can succeed in a task.

Finally, every child, preschool and school age, needs to be free of the tyranny of the peer group. I was given Professor Bronfenbrenner's comments of yesterday and I could not agree more with their theme. Professor Bronfenbrenner correctly emphasized the importance of the damage that can occur to a child who becomes frightened of disagreeing with the values of the peer group.

Normally, in a family situation, one does not have children in one's age bracket, and therefore the child orients toward adults and adopts their values.

In a situation where there are 30 children of the same age and only two adults, it is easy for the child to assume that the power for giving resources, praise, and punishment comes from the peers, rather than from adults, and this can make a child anxious, frightened, and inhibited over disagreeing with the peer group.

Let me relate these general facts about psychological development to day care. Let me say, first, that I view day care neither as a devilish instrument that would subvert a child nor a panacea for all ills. It clearly can help some children and, therefore, deserves national attention.

Let me talk about the advantages of day care and then the disadvantages. There are three potential advantages of day care for American children. First, more American mothers, whether they be poor or middle class, wish to work and that need has to be honored.

These mothers have no place for their children and it is an advantage to have them in either an approved family day-care arrangement or licensed day care.

This issue is the primary case for Federal support of day care.

A second reason is that there are some parents, and they cut across all races and economic conditions, who are indifferent toward their children. Perhaps they don't want that fifth child or did not want the first child. A nurturant, warm, concerned center can be beneficial to this child. Finally, if a day-care or family center is well run it can expose the child to experiences and begin to teach him number, letter, and word skills which will be beneficial when he enters school.

These are three obvious advantages of group care, provided there is proper training of personnel.

There are, of course, disadvantages. The first is the fact that, once group care becomes popular, many parents who had not thought of using day care will assume it is the proper thing for their child.

My personal feeling is that the estimates about the number of parents that will use day care have to be wrong, because once a critical mass in the community use day care many others will change their attitude and I think we will have long, long waiting lines.

The pressure will be to pack maximum numbers of children into group-care centers. This will create the problem of 60 or 70 3-year-olds in a room with two or three adults and create problems of anxiety over disagreeing with peers and the loss of individuality. These are the only two things that I am worried about as far as group care is concerned.

A moment earlier I suggested that we think more seriously about family day care. I have had an opportunity during the last month to visit several family day-care projects; one, in Pasadena, Calif., which impressed me.

I would like to urge this committee to facilitate the legislative wording for use of Federal funds so that parents at the local level have an option between family day care and group care.

By family day care, I mean a woman who has been approved by a local council—licensed, in a sense—to take care of no more than five children in her home.

In Pasadena there was a publicly supported day-care center which could have more children than it did, because many families preferred family day care. These parents preferred to send their children to family day care even though the cost was more than it would have been had they chosen the group-care center.

I realize that it is easier to write legislation for group care than for family day care, but this should seriously be considered.

I would like to speak briefly to the ratios in these centers. Where there are infants involved I would not like to see a ratio of more than four infants to any one adult, where by infant I mean the first 2 years of life. When we get to the preschool period, ages 3 to 6 years, I would not like to see a ratio of more than 12 children to any one adult.

I view the paraprofessional aid as an adult. Trained high school and college students are perfectly adequate for day-care work, assuming a trained supervisor.

In the family day-care context no more than two infants to one adult and no more than four preschool children for one adult. A final point is one I am sure Professor Bronfenbrenner emphasized.

Parents must view the group-care center as an extension of the family, not a separate institution that has taken responsibility for their child. When I visited Czechoslovakia two summers ago and was taken to day-care centers in Prague I asked the supervisors what was their main problem. The salient complaint was that parents began to assume that the center was responsible for their children. They stopped picking them up at 5 and began to assume that the responsibilities for character training, education, and health, belonged to the state-controlled center.

It is important that parents feel the center is an extension of the family. I know of no procedure that can aid this more than parental involvement in the centers at a local level.

I will terminate my comments now. I am most willing to answer any questions you may have.

Senator MONDALE. Dr. Kagan, we are most grateful to you. First of all we will include your prepared statement at the end of your testimony.

Have you had a chance to look at the comprehensive child development bill which I have introduced?

Dr. KAGAN. Yes, I have.

Senator MONDALE. Are you in a position to comment on that at this time?

Dr. KAGAN. Yes. I feel very positive about this bill. After comparing it with bills written earlier, I believe it is an excellent bill.

I like the idea of a local council, and funds for training.

At the moment, for all practical purposes, there isn't a trained cadre of people for day care. It is mandatory, once any legislation of this kind is passed, to have funds for training of those who will work in the day-care center.

Senator MONDALE. We did something unique in this proposal I have never seen before. The program begins a year after the bill is passed and we used the first year for training so that we don't pour a lot of money into a program for which professionals and others are not ready. Hopefully the supply and demand will be met in some rational way.

Dr. KAGAN. I feel positive about this bill and hope that this or a similar bill is the one passed.

Senator MONDALE. I asked Dr. Bronfenbrenner yesterday if he could point to a country or countries which he would recommend this committee view from the standpoint of quality preschool efforts. Are you in a position to comment on that?

Dr. KAGAN. Yes; it is important that France and Scandinavia be visited for obvious reasons. The structures of their societies are similar to ours. The personality traits that are valued are similar and my brief visits and conversations with people who have spent much time in these countries indicate that they are close to model structures. I urge members of the committee to visit both those areas.

Senator MONDALE. We hear a good deal about the Israeli preschool efforts.

Dr. KAGAN. I think Israel should be visited as a comparison case. But the social structure and the strains within that nation are unique and it is difficult to use it as a model for the United States.

Senator MONDALE. You placed an emphasis on social and economic diversity, trying to get middle-class kids into these programs. Do you think that is of value and, if so, why?

Dr. KAGAN. Very much so. In my opinion, and that of many other social scientists, the more mix of poor and economically advantaged children the more quickly we will be able to overcome some of the deep tensions and frictions that exist in our society.

Senator MONDALE. In the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunities we are trying to grapple with this tragic situation in our country in which so many hundreds of thousands of children never seem to have a chance, just don't seem to make it. It shows up in many, many ways.

For example, in Berkeley, Calif., they are trying a good-faith integration program. But some of the children have had kindergarten through grade 7 in disadvantaged schools. Then they sit alongside kids with whom they are supposed to be integrated but their basic comprehension and skill levels are 3 or 4 years behind.

I can't help wondering how a young person can sit through that without being damaged. Do you see that quality comprehensive preschool programs as providing part of the answer to this tragedy of inequality of education in our country?

Dr. KAGAN. I do. I think beginning around 3½ or 4 years of age we could begin to spot the 20 or 25 percent of children in the center who are likely to have difficulty when they enter the public school.

Let me add that I hope in 5 years we will have a national program where every high school in every local community sends adolescents to the preschool and primary grades every week. A one-to-one tutorial situation is the one in which children learn best. I personally have no doubt that if each child had one high school student, paraprofessional, or neighborhood wife working on number and letter skills with a child alone, we would have much of this problem solved.

Fortunately we are generating a group of high school students who want to do this. My own daughter, a sophomore in high school, spends a day a week in a Brookline, Mass., public school working with young children. She is enormously gratified and the children are sad that June is coming soon.

Senator MONDALE. We give our own kids great nutrition, great housing, great education, great upward mobility, great self-esteem. We give them everything except meaning and they are smart enough to know that. At ages 14 and 15 they are ready to go and they want to go; they want to know who they are and they want to be part of a better society, and they say, "What can I do?" The answer is "Nothing; shut up and maybe someday you will be an adult."

Why not have a national program of matching the talents and the affections that these young people have for American society with the tremendous needs of children who need the love and affection and the help which these children can give.

The only problem I have with that is I think many times middle-class white children deliver a certain white paternalism which can be very damaging. I have seen VISTA workers work on Indian reservations. They cannot understand why they are not loved. But some of them want to make white people out of the Indians and that is why they are not loved.

How do we deal with these sensitivity issues?

Dr. KAGAN. I think that paternalism is a problem, but suppose the child had a selection of who he wanted to work with. I might add, Senator, I am always pleasantly surprised by the receptivity of Americans to this idea.

Senator MONDALE. What is the magnitude of the missed opportunity in early childhood in this country? How would you describe it?

Dr. KAGAN. In inches, seconds, or dollars?

Senator MONDALE. In other words, as we grapple with this inequality of education will a preschool effort help some, will it help a great deal, will it be a revolutionary cataclysmic success? I mean I am afraid that we can oversell as well as undersell a program.

In what context would you put the potential of this program if it were done right?

Dr. KAGAN. That is a perfect way to phrase the question. One of the serious problems in our society is that we have too large a range of competence on the skills, the society values, and much disagreement, too, on fundamental values. Here we are experiencing much tension. The reason why I think a comprehensive preschool bill like this one can help is that it will narrow the enormous gap of ability, and second, it may begin to weave a more homogenous set of values.

Senator MONDALE. Senator Taft?

Senator TAFT. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Doctor, it is a pleasure to have you here this morning and to have your very helpful testimony. There is one area in particular that we have not discussed. I realize that certainly it isn't perhaps so basic as some other areas in approaching the problem of all children, but nevertheless it is a very difficult problem in this country.

I am referring to the problem of racism and the question of how we should handle this insofar as day-care training is concerned. As you know from the floor debate yesterday, we are concerned with this problem insofar as our schools are concerned, trying to implement and aid programs to bring about meaningful integration.

Have you given some thought to this question so far as the day-care program is concerned and what would your approaches be in this regard?

Dr. KAGAN. Yes; what worries me most about our minority groups in this country is that many of them believe, deeply and profoundly, that they are being manipulated and that they do not have adequate control of their environment.

This belief is leading to mutual suspicion and feeding the ugly flame of racism. I think the most important issue in the creation of day-care centers is the degree of control parents in the local community feel they have over the education of their children. A feeling of control may begin to erode the belief that they cannot control the values adopted by their children. Second, we all know that you begin to love and care for those enterprises in which you invest some effort.

Hence, we should maximize parental control at the neighborhood and community level. I think this would have an enormous social benefit.

Senator TAFT. To be a little more specific about this particular problem, are you advocating in the development of a day-care program that we attempt to integrate to the same extent as in the public schools, to a greater extent or to a lesser extent?

Dr. KAGAN. I like the notion of the council through which applications are made. I would like to see these councils integrated. But I would let the council decide, since it is an integrated unit, on the composition of a particular center rather than have it dictated from the top.

My prediction will be that the council, if integrated, will promote integrated centers. I would like to leave that decision to the council at the local level.

Senator TAFT. To what extent then do you believe that there ought to be national standards involved in the day-care program?

Dr. KAGAN. Senator, unfortunately, the only thing one can standardize are diversions like age of teacher, education of caretaker,

amount of space in the day-care center and, in my opinion, these are secondary issues. The most important ingredient in a group-care center is the humanity of the people who work with the children.

We are not able to standardize humanity, and I think we will be in trouble if we become nervous and decide, prematurely, that we had better standardize something.

We will begin to make up rules, but the only things you can make up rules for are things you can count and we may put an impediment in the proper running of these centers.

I am unhappy that we do not have a test for humanity. If we did, I would be for licensing. But as long as we don't, I want administrators to be maximally free to hire the best teachers they can.

Senator TAFT. Would you say that it is inevitable that if you set up a broad nationwide day-care program that problems are going to develop so that certain groups within the professional and paraprofessional area will start setting up standards? In day-care situations, with which I have been familiar, one of the problems is that we have had the problem of trying to establish some standards to begin with and then it becomes a question of how professional you get or where you draw the line.

Are you going to leave this entirely up to the councils or are you going to leave it up to the States, or up to the local communities, or are you going to leave it up to HEW or some other department?

Dr. KAGAN. Let me be practical. Your questions are profound and serious. These are not easy issues to resolve. We do not have a large trained cadre and it would take 10 years to train a sufficient number of people to man these centers. It is not very practical to write licensing laws because one will be constantly violating them in order to man the centers.

In my own experience, when there is careful selection by responsible people, day care is fine. I have been involved in a day-care center in the Boston area and we had a staff of five people, none of whom had graduated from high school. Everyone had had children and these women were among the most sensitive, humane, wise people I have met. Their behavior with the children was beautiful.

Senator TAFT. Did you have to comply with certain Massachusetts requirements?

Dr. KAGAN. Yes, we did; we had to comply with Massachusetts requirements for the building. But there are no educational requirements in Massachusetts for people who work with children.

Senator MONDALE. Would you yield? I talked to a superintendent in the bay area of California who is using Spanish-speaking mothers to teach bilingual education. He says it is the most fantastically successful program he has ever seen. These are not licensed teachers, they are mothers who speak in English and Spanish. He says he has never done anything that he thought had a more dramatic yield than the efforts of those mothers.

Dr. KAGAN. This also holds for the school situation. I was asked last week to advise the Houston district on their title I program. I spent a day in Houston visiting four schools. I saw licensed middle-class white teachers in black classrooms with a black aide. The white teachers told me it took 3 months for this teacher to understand what the children were saying. The black aide understood

from the beginning but, because she didn't have a degree, she had to sit in the back while the teacher was in charge.

Clearly, we want both women in charge. Here is a situation in which the law in Houston was not helping the children.

It is the humanity of the woman or man that is critical, not his knowledge of subject matter, for the preschool child.

Senator TAFT. How much and what type of control do you feel that parents ought to have over the operation of the individual group day-care centers? Obviously you have been running one funded by NIH and I rather suspect by the amount of your knowledge and the force of your personality that you have been running it.

Dr. KAGAN. That question can't be answered easily. The parents and the people responsible for the center should create a board. The board is responsible and the parents, therefore, must comply with the decisions of the board.

If one or two parents complain, they can withdraw their children from the school. It seems to me we have to protect both the teacher and the parents from constant friction. A board made up of some parents, experts, and center staff should be the responsible body.

In other words, I am not for complete parental control. That could be dangerous.

Senator TAFT. Let's go back to a less interesting but still very difficult area, the one of financing of these centers. First of all, I would like on the basis of your estimates the approximate cost per child for services in a developmental day-care center. Would you then relate the financial handling of this situation to having local councils control it and having the funds come from some source in the Government or even supplemented by private funds as well?

You may well get into some private funding situations where there are certain controls under United Givers Fund, for instance, that are involved.

Dr. KAGAN. As you might suspect, private centers run more efficiently than public centers. My impression is that, if you are working with preschool children 2½ to 5 years of age, $45 a week will run a pretty good private center. A public center which has more bureaucracy will probably be given $55 or $60 a week. You have to add 10–20 percent for infants. It is more expensive to have a center for the first 2 years of life.

Custodial care would be less and the figures Dr. Ziegler presented are generally correct.

Senator TAFT. What size national program?

Dr. KAGAN. It depends how many children. A reasonable prediction is that if this becomes a popular and approved way of raising American children one could have half the population of children aged 0 to 6 requesting day care. You could spend all the money you want.

Senator TAFT. Which would be about 13 million children, or something like that?

Dr. KAGAN. Yes; 13 million children at $60 a week which is $3,000 a child a year. If you pause to multiply those figures you have an enormous amount of money—$39 billion.

Senator TAFT. Would you comment on the relationship of something you just touched on there and that is the extent to which you think this

program or this recommendation fits in with the whole question of welfare dependency and income? Obviously you have already indicated that you certainly should not have an economic stratification, if you like, within the program itself. But to what extent is this related to welfare dependency and how do you know the potential of the Family Assistance plan approach insofar as this problem is concerned?

Dr. KAGAN. I tend to agree with the commentators who say that one of the major justifications for Federal funding of care is to help the economic stability of the poor family. I accept that premise.

Senator TAFT. How about the family day-care situation? Are you thinking there of financing families, in effect, to take care of their own children and a few others?

Dr. KAGAN. I would like to see the legislation provide an option so that the mother who chooses to pay a mother for taking care of her children is paid out of funds that might have been used for group day care. I would be very pleased if that option were in the final legislation.

Senator TAFT. Would you comment generally on the women's rights aspects of this problem and the question as to whether we should be talking or thinking about taking actions to try to encourage mothers to stay in their own home rather than go out and work or under what circumstances this ought to be done?

Dr. KAGAN. That is a hard question because I tend to be an old-fashioned man on this issue. We have educated many intelligent young women and we should not be surprised that, following their education, they want to use it. They want to be mothers but also wish to have a career that is gratifying.

Having educated these women, we must agree that, if they wish to use their skills for personal gratification, that is a reasonable request.

Senator TAFT. Would you comment on the experience under the 4(c) program? Are you familiar with that?

Dr. KAGAN. I am afraid I am not.

Senator TAFT. There is a pilot community-coordinated child-care program designed by a panel to coordinate existing programs on the local level.

Dr. KAGAN. I have heard about it at meetings but I am afraid I have inadequate knowledge to say anything intelligent.

Senator TAFT. Thank you very much.

Senator MONDALE. Would you recommend a proposal which would offer incentives to public schools to operate programs like the tutoring program you have suggested?

Dr. KAGAN. Very much so, yes; I would be in favor of it.

Senator MONDALE. Would you submit for the record some early childhood locations that you think ought to be looked at and viewed by this committee overseas as well as in this country that represent some of the promising different ideas, maybe some of the failures, too?

Dr. KAGAN. I don't know the addresses. Mrs. Lansburgh, who will testify after me, does.

A good private center I visited is called Living and Learning Centers and it is in the Boston-Cambridge area.

Mrs. LANSBURGH. This is a book about a number of programs that do work and there is a listing of them.

Senator MONDALE. Could we have that? We can get a copy. Thank you.

Dr. KAGAN. I think your staff should visit some of the parent-child centers that are funded by both OEO and HEW. I have seen the one in Birmingham, Ala., which is good. There are others that are not as good.

Your staff should see the range of quality and programing.

Senator MONDALE. Thank you very much, Dr. Kagan, for a most useful contribution to our committee and we are most grateful to you for being with us this morning.

(The prepared statement of Dr. Kagan follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. JEROME KAGAN, CHAIRMAN, WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE FORUM ON "DEVELOPMENTAL DAY-CARE SERVICES FOR CHILDREN"

The need for child care services outside the family is now in the forefront of America's consciousness. We used to ask whether preschool educational services were good or necessary, but now we ask how the services should be implemented and who should pay for them.

In 1969 over thirty million working women had over eleven million children under sixteen years of age, a figure that is eight times the comparable totals in 1940.

Close to five million of these children were under six years of age. Since only twelve percent of this group can be cared for in licensed day care centers the vast majority of preschool children who do not have grandmothers, aunts, or older sisters to care for them while their mother is working either have a baby sitter come to the home or are taken to another woman's home for the day.

This service is viewed by both the mother and the substitute caretaker as custodial, not as growth enhancing. There are several issues surrounding acceptance of Federal aid in the crisis for the need for day care centers.

Who should get priority of enrollment in the centers?

Who should determine the content of the programs?

And what should the content of these programs be?

Each of these issues is very complex and not easily answered.

In most cultures over the world it is usually the case that mothers do not have primary responsibility for their children and they always get help from aunts, grandmothers, cousins, and older children in the family.

In fact, it has probably been the exception throughout human history rather than the rule that the biological mother was the only caretaker during the opening years of the child's life.

However, it is not easy to transfer responsibility to other family members in today's modern American community. There are too many young parents who live too far from their families, and older children in the family go to school when they are six years of age. They are not around to help the mother with the infant. Thus the procedures that man relied on for centuries are not appropriate for this generation of Americans.

New social institutions are being invested and the concept of day care is becoming an increasingly popular solution.

It is the opinion of the writer that day care is a very broad term that can include the paying of a next door neighbor, the participation of parents in a block, or a spacious brick building where strangers take care of a child from early infancy until kindergarten.

I believe that the differences among day care should not emphasize the physical facility, but rather the psychological atmosphere. How is the child handled, what values is he taught, what kind of educational program is he exposed to, what kind of attitudes does he acquire—especially toward people.

The child can be happy or sad, frightened or secure, trusting or angry, in a neighbor's apartment, a commune, or a newly built day care center.

Although there is no ideal set of goals or perfect set of experiences that every young child should be exposed to independent of the community in which he lives, we must come to some decision as to what kind of care should be promoted.

Since America applauds the ethnic pluralism in our country it is not reasonable to assume that one kind of program is best for all children. Since parents must have a stake in the values and skills taught to their children parents

should be involved in the implementation and strategies of care in day care centers.

Since there is no perfect set of traits for a child to possess the task of deciding the ideal psychological goals for a child is an ethical rather than a scientific issue. However, there is some information psychologists can provide.

Infant Care:

One of the basic needs of the infant is to develop an attachment to, and trust in, adults. And this requires a close and consistent relationship with adults who care for him.

Consistency is most important. Therefore in day care centers one should structure the situation so that there is maximal continuity of care of an infant by one particular person. It is also important that ratios be no greater than four infants to one adult. Also, it should be kept in mind that placement in day care seems to be most threatening to children from six to eighteen months of age. Thus if infants are going to be placed in day care, they should be placed before this age or after this age.

There should be training of all day care workers in the kinds of psychological procedures that are most appropriate for young infants.

The Preschool Child:

The child from two to six years needs to establish an expectancy of success when he initiates a task, freedom from excessive restriction, and controlled variety. One of the dangers in large day care centers for preschool children is that administrative efficiency may become a guiding principle.

Too much noise, dirt, or disarray may lead the operators of the center to fear gossipy reports on mismanagement.

The best way to keep order is to control the psychological atmosphere, but this control may establish an atmosphere that is inimical to growth. The preschool child is attempted to conclude that what he sees ought to be.

Thus the behavior displayed by the day care workers becomes an important source of belief for him. The child also needs one to one periods of interaction with a particular adult.

Psychologists have shown that informal dialogues between one adult and one child are as important as any specific curricula in promoting cognitive growth. A one to one natural relation between adult and child is very beneficial to psychological growth.

One of the possible characteristics of large day care centers that is a potential cause of concern is that in a setting with many children and few adults the typical three or four year old may develop apprehension over being different from or rejected by other children.

In a center with many children the balance of rewards and punishments can shift from an adult, which normally happens in the family, to other children.

Unfortunately, the peer group is less rational and less consistent than adults. Therefore the child is vulnerable to becoming afraid of social rejection or social isolation—of being different from the majority opinon of the peer group.

This can make a child overconforming and in many day care centers in Western Europe this has been the unfortunate result. Administrators of these centers have shown concern about implications for future personality.

The peer group unfortunately communicates its evaluation of the child whether it be positive or negative by giving or withholding group acceptance depending on the child's assets and liabilities as the peer group judges it.

Finally the preschool child should believe that at least one member of the staff knows him, is aware of him and acknowledges his strengths and weaknesses. Many of us believe that the day care center should maximize the likelihood that one or two adults are highly involved with each child in the center, responding to his fears, successes, and failures and encouraging new found talents. The relationship between people in the center and the child is critical and many psychologists emphasize the extreme importance of adequate training of staff and recommend that training courses and training centers be established.

This is the most urgent need at the present time and the funding of these training programs should occur with the shortest possible delay.

There is some possibility that mass day care can subtly and insidiously persuade parents that day care personnel are the responsible agents for the child.

One of the oldest maxims of social life states that one should never separate the twin functions of responsibility and power.

Since the family should and probably will have the power to decide what its child believes, how it will behave and whether or not it will attend the day care center, the family must have the primary responsibility for the child.

It is dangerous to give that responsibility to any person or agency that does not have total control of the child.

Despite journalistic rhetoric implying that family is growing obsolete, many, many educators and psychologists continue to believe that the family will remain the central unit in Western society.

It is not an accident that the human family has survived for thousands of generations and is still the most frequently used arrangement for raising children. One might regard this phenomenon as an evolutionary test of the efficiency and validity of the family structure.

There are positives that can come from day care. Wisely administred, day care can provide experiences that children do not often receive in the home.

They can teach the child how to establish a cooperative relationship with other children rather than one that is excessively competitive, rivalrous, or fearful.

There are children who are isolated from peers their own age and do not have the opportunity to develop interactions with others. Day care can remedy that lack.

Day care, by providing materials that might not be present at home and guidance that might be absent can allow children to perfect special talents whether it be in arts, singing, arithmetic, reading or physical coordination.

Day care can, therefore, open vistas to children who have talents that might not be discovered in the home environment. There are children to whom day care can be therapeutic because it frees them from the overprotective, overwhelming anxiety that comes from hovering, nervous parents who accelerate their children in an unnatural way.

Finally, there are children who are lonely because of indifferent and, at times, rejecting parents. A nurturant day care center can fill this void and give the child a sense of his value.

However, we cannot place twenty children or ten infants in a clean room with new toys and expect these dividends to occur. A day care center should be regarded as an extension of the family, not something apart from it.

Summary:

In sum, day care is not to be viewed as a panacea for ills nor as an evil institution that will destroy the development of the American child.

It is important to acknowledge that the quality of the child's relationship with adults and the predictability of his environment are two of the most important requirements.

It is urged that training programs for day care workers be initiated at once and that funds be provided for training throughout the nation.

It is also urged that alternatives to group care be promoted. The writer believes that family day care is a very important adjunct and often can be more useful and helpful to children than group day care. It is urged that any legislation consider funds that might help support family day care, and, of course, funds for the education of mothers who care for children in their own homes.

Senator MONDALE. Our final witness this morning is Mrs. Therese Lansburgh.

STATEMENT OF MRS. THERESE W. LANSBURGH, VICE CHAIRMAN, WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE FORUM ON "DEVELOPMENTAL DAY-CARE SERVICES FOR CHILDREN"; ACCOMPANIED BY THEODORE T. TAYLOR, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, DAY-CARE AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL OF AMERICA

Mrs. LANSBURGH. I have with me Mr. Theodore T. Taylor, the executive director of the Day-Care Council.

Senator MONDALE. You may proceed.

Mrs. LANSBURGH. Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee, it is a pleasure to be with you this morning and I have

67-582 O—71——6

been enjoying hearing the very interesting and thoughtful questions you have been asking Dr. Kagan.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to share with you the findings of the Developmental Child-Care Services Forum of the 1970 White House Conference on Children. I speak from the perspective of having served as vice chairman of the Developmental Child-Care Services Forum.

Mr. Chairman, it is with high hopes and deep concern that I speak with you today. The establishment of this subcommittee is long overdue. This nation has been neglecting its children. There have been congressional committees which relate to labor and submerged lands, to agriculture and to Federal charters, holidays and celebrations. But it is only when this commonwealth is approaching its 200th birthday that a subcommittee on children is established.

Americans like to think of themselves as a child-oriented society, when in reality we are a child-neglecting, at times a child damaging society. Indeed, the unreal concept of ourselves as a child-oriented society is one which is extremely damaging to this Nation, to the future of our young, and to those of us who will live in the world they will lead when they are grown.

It is ironic that our consumer-oriented society will swiftly adapt its means of production to build a better mousetrap, but finds a hundred excuses not to adjust its institutions to create a better quality of human life. We are willing to invest in cybernetics and in space, but not our own children.

The suggestion that we are a child-neglecting society comes as a shock to many. But examine the evidence. We pay more for almost everything that we are willing to invest in our children.

Dr. Bronfenbrenner detailed yesterday, and eloquently, how children are no longer primarily foci of the personal lives of far too many of our citizens. On a national level, as at State and local levels, children rank extremely low in priority. According to Robert Finch during his term as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, we were spending $9 for every aging adult for every $1 we spend on children.

Senator TAFT. Might I interrupt? Is that figure a Federal dollar figure?

Mrs. LANSBURGH. That is Federal dollar.

I am not advocating that we reduce the amount spent on our older citizens, but I do urge that we allocate more for our children, a long-term investment. We must as a nation recognize that we have an obligation and an opportunity, in providing for the nurture of our children. For the cumulative cost of not addressing ourselves to this overriding concern is far greater than the preventive expenditure necessary in education, health, day-care, nutritional, and mental health services.

Each decade the White House Conference on Children meets to propose a national direction for the decade ahead. In 1970, delegates to the White House Conference voted that their most urgent overriding concern was to provide for America "comprehensive family-oriented child development programs including health services, day care and early childhood education." Developmental child care was a clear mandate for the seventies.

Two important factors are forcing a new national look at, and crying for a dedication and commitment to, the needs of children. One is the explosion of knowledge about child growth and development, an emphasis on the importance of early experiences.

The other is the changing patterns of living, the urbanization, mobility, the disappearance or unavailability of the extended family which used to be available when families with young children needed help.

Today, the nuclear family is alone and isolated. Where families are not available in time of crisis or over the long haul, society needs to step in and assist in the process of socialization, in the development of its future citizens. We must respond to this need and opportunity.

Since the 1960 White House Conference, we have learned enough to assert child care's right to national priority. We have a decade of research emphasizing that the parameters for individual development are formed in earliest childhood.

We know of critical states which, if neglected or mishandled, may result in inhibiting behavior at best, in irreversible damage at worst. We have learned that development is a cumulative process, and that opportunity—or lack of it—directly influences potential.

Nature and nurture interact at every stage of development. Heredity may influence a child's physical growth, but enough food and developmental opportunities affect his physical, intellectual, and psychological progress. Day care does not substitute for, but supplements, a mother's love.

I would like to underline what Dr. Kagan said about the importance of parental control, because the fact of keeping the parent involved with this child in contrast to what has been happening in Czechoslovakia where parents are no longer feeling the responsibility of their children is tremendously keen and a part of what we want to determine as we set about establishing a new system of social services.

Senator MONDALE. One of the problems we have in American life is we think the poor are inferior and somehow a black mother on welfare loves her children and understands them less than we think she ought to.

Because they are inferior in our opinion then we develop all kinds of strategies for taking over and running it in our paternalistic way. Of course, just when we do that the process becomes totally destructive, it seems to me, because by the whole manner in which the job is done there is an implication that there is something wrong with the mother, something wrong with the culture, and then the child who doesn't sense affection and esteem is going to be badly crippled no matter how well he can read or write.

That is why I want to see this thing under the control of the parents, because so long as people don't understand that I don't think we are to be trusted with these kids.

Mrs. LANSBURGH. I think there is a paternalistic inclination to do for, and as a social worker I recognize this particularly, to do for others instead of helping others to help themselves. In essence, if that is what we really believe in, then we will allow parents to have control over what happens to their children.

This is their responsibility and we would be usurping it if we try to take it over from them. I do think it is extremely important to allow

the parent to determine what he wants for his child. Then he feels he has some power. The interesting thing is what happens to parents, too, as a result of this exercise.

I think of an instance in which a family day-care mother was identified as someone who was going to be eligible to have children placed in her home and to operate as a family day-care mother and before she ever got a child into her home she was being judgmental of her neighbors because already her selfesteem had stepped up a notch.

People do develop the wonderful capacity of thinking more highly of themselves, of feeling they are in control of their own destiny and not controlled by elements outside of their control. They do develop this wonderful human capacity to grow.

I think particularly of a mother in a center who was on AFDC and who has worked with her child, and she became an aide in the classroom. Now she is a social casework aide, she is off of welfare, she is supporting her five children and at the same time she is being a marvelous mother because when she comes home she sits down with those children for an hour.

She says, "We don't cook or clean, we just sit down and visit and tell each other what we have done all day long." I think she is being a marvelous success as a human being and parent and a wage earner. She is the only wage earner in her family.

I think a lot I have to say here is material which has been covered by Dr. Kagan. Quality day care can compensate for those grim economic determinants that all but condemn some children to a life of limited horizons.

The neglect of young children in America forms a background of individual tragedy and potential national calamity against which all current efforts must be gauged. But balanced against this dark background there is great hope.

With recent years we have learned through research of the exciting potential of growth and development. It is a change which to me offers a potential as dramatic and as far reaching in the history of man sets the limits beyond which we cannot go.

I call it the human revolution. We have within sight, if we will but determine to take advantage of this opportunity, the possibility of preventing the cultural retardation which affects much of the third of our Nation existing in economically deprived circumstances, of offering all American youngsters the opportunity to develop the fullest use of their abilities. The choice is real and the choice is ours.

What we have been learning during the past decade is that the environment has far more to do with the development of an individual's capacity to cope with life than we previously suspected. Heredity sets the limits beyond which we can not go.

Some children are born with serious retardation, but this is only a fraction of the group now called retarded. Many children have normal potential but become culturally retarded; that is, their development has been stunted by a lack of opportunities for intellectual growth.

The President's Commission on Mental Retardation estimated that only 25 percent of those designated as retarded are genetically retarded; 75 percent appeared to be retarded as the result of sociocultural factors, which could have been prevented.

I repeat: the choice is real and the choice is ours.

Today we know that the ability to learn and to solve problems is developed during the years before a child starts to school. Sixty percent of the ability to communicate develops by the time a child is 3 years old and deeply affects his ability to read, write, talk, listen, to function in this verbal world of ours.

A recent experiment by Dr. Herbert J. Sprigle in Jacksonville, Fla., shows that the intelligence of children can be substantially affected by intervention at this early stage. Sprigle divided 72 disadvantaged 5-year-olds into three groups of 24. One was involved in a carefully designed "learning to learn" program; another became part of a traditional kindergarten. The third group stayed home, unexposed to any preschool training.

The results were dramatic. At the end of a school year, tests showed the learning-to-learn group scored 21 IQ points over the "no training" group—which actually decreased during the year—while the traditional kindergarten's group score remained constant. Also, the experimental groups are still doing markedly better in regular school than their counterparts.

Contrary to popular opinion, by and large, our public schools do not succeed in changing the IQ of children. They do help the child to maintain his level of performance in ratio to his chronological age but rarely does a child's IQ increase during his school years.

As a matter of fact, the IQ of a child who starts behind usually falls another seven to nine points during his school years. The time to intervene in a child's life is the time when we can successfully give him the tools with which to use his intellectual capacities; that is, during preschool years.

This does not mean, if he has quality day care during preschool years that we can then rest on our laurels. Of course, results will "wash out" if schooling is inadequate or overcrowded or not geared to the child's needs, interests, and abilities.

It is like giving a child a meal one day and complaining the next week when he says he is hungry. He needs food for his mind just as he needs food for his body, steadily. As the forum report stated, "Every moment of a child's life is learning—what he can and cannot do, what adults expect and think of him, what people need and like and hate, what his role in society will be. His best chances for a satisfying and constructive adulthood grow from a satisfying and constructive childhood and infancy. Sound development cannot be promoted too early."

I will skip a good deal of this.

Senator MONDALE. We will include the full statement as though read and you may emphasize those points which you wish.

Mrs. LANSBURGH. Delegates to the 1970 White House Conference came with a new understanding of child development, much of which simply could not have been known a decade earlier. We know, for example, that the developmental tasks of infancy and early childhood can be encouraged or retarded by experimental opportunity, and like the growth of teeth, this must happen at the appropriate period.

Early stimulation is mandatory for development of the capacity to learn, for later success in school and in life, for the possibility

of breaking what becomes a cycle of poverty, dependency, and hopelessness.

Emotional and social growth is also seriously affected. What happens to boys and girls who are left alone, or who come home day after day to an empty house? Loneliness, fear, a feeling of being unwanted, is more devastating at vulnerable young ages.

Add to this physical danger and anger, anger at those who are so completely unconcerned about his welfare. Feelings of anger and agression need to be channeled, to be controlled at an early age, for the possibility of changing life patterns decreases as a child grows older. The early years determine whether a child grows up to be a capable, responsible, contributing member of society, a worker, a consumer, a taxpayer; or whether he becomes dependent, poor, and perhaps needing to act out his anger and feelings of rejection and frustration.

The new knowledge, combining with rapidly changing patterns of living, has forced a crisis for children and their parents, a crisis which day care helps to answer. This is the reason that in the 1970 conference it was almost inevitable that early childhood development and day care should have been called for in almost every report, and selected by the delegates through balloting as the first priority meriting national attention, commitment, and funds.

Day care is a new concept and an old one. Middle- and upper-class families have been sending their children to nursery school and kindergartens, which are a form of day care, for a long time. But full day's care—that was for the poor and deviant, and only babysitting was necessary. These attitudes, in view of new societal changes, and of new knowledge, must be discarded. Day care must now be a developmental opportunity: social, emotional, intellectual, and physical.

Thus, day care refers to the wide variety of organized arrangements for children living in their own homes, which parents select on a continuing basis for a part of the day. Day care is provided in child development centers, Headstart programs, nursery schools day nurseries, kindergartens, family day-care homes, before, after-school and vacation programs, as well as full day's care.

The quality of the program should be the same regardless of the number of hours, the auspice of funding source, the name of the service, or the child's age. A program should be judged by how well it promotes the maturational, motivational, affectional, cognitive, social, and physical growth of the child relative to the child's needs, capacities, and state of development.

A quality service provides (1) a strong educational program geared to the age, ability, interests, and temperamental organization of each child; (2) adequate nutrition; (3) opportunity for physical activity including large and small muscle use; (4) a health program including physical examinations and health services where needed; (5) opportunity for social and emotional growth including a balance between individual attention, affectional support, control and the joy of meeting new challenges; group experiences and, as appropriate, time for solitude and internalization of ideas and experiences; (6) opportunities for parent education, participation, involvement and control; and (7) social services as needed by the child and his family.

The report of forum 17 was explicit in identifying a number of classroom program components as especially significant:

"1. A good program must focus on the development of warm, trusting, and mutually respectful social relationships with adults and other children. Such relationships form the basis not only for the social and personal development of the child, but also for his future ability to learn from others.

"2. The prorgam must help develop self-identity so that each child views himself and his background as worthy of respect and dignity. A child's image of himself as a member of a racial, cultural, linguistic, religious, or economic group is basic to a strong self-concept. 'Cultural relevance,' therefore, is not a separate political issue but an integral part of human development.

"Supplementary child care must not alienate a child from his family and his peers. Those in charge of programs must be knowledgeable of and sensitive to the values and patterns of life in the children's homes. To help correct past inadequacies and injustices and move toward a truly human heritage for future generations, children must be permitted to learn about our diverse cultures and their contributions to modern America.

"4. Attention must be given to the full development of each child, taking into account his or her individual ability, personality, imagination, and independence, and resisting the degradation caused by racist, sexist, economic, cultural, and other stereotypes.

"5. A good program should seek the knowledge and resources of those trained in, and familiar with, child development for selection and use of equipment, space, and methods to achieve the desired goals."

The need for day-care services is immense and urgent. In 1965 there were 12 million children under the age of 14 whose mothers were working. That number has increased greatly in the last years, as the number of working mothers, and especially of working mothers of preschool children, increases.

At this point, I want to emphasize that I do not believe all women should work. I feel that democracy should allow each woman the freedom of choice to work if she wants or deems it necessary for her family, without penalizing her children. That choice does not exist with any regularity today.

Over 1 million children of working mothers, according to the Census Bureau survey of 1965, were being left alone, with no one to care for or to supervise them. Another million and a half were being left in inadequate and often damaging care—a neighbor down the street to look in, a sibling often too young for responsibility—kept home from school to take charge of younger members of the family; left in unlicensed centers, or even, in many States, in centers licensed only for physical facilities with no concern for the quality of care.

Another million were taken by their mothers to their places of work. A total of 3,500,000 children of working mothers are in need of day care services. The number has increased yearly. These figures do not include those children with handicaps or families with handicaps, where day-care services are also urgently needed. The 640,000 spaces in licensed day-care services although up from 182,000 since 1962, barely touches this iceberg of need. The gap is enormous. It has

been estimated that in no community is more than 20 percent of the need being met.

In our discussion the numbers of working women seems to assume priority, because this is the area in which the visible increase has grown astronomically in recent years. But we must not forget children with handicaps, and families with handicaps.

The availabiilty of day-care services can often avoid the more expensive, emotionally and financially, cost of foster care and institutionalization. Take the one area of mental health: The Joint Commission on the Mental Health of Children estimates that nearly 10 million children need help in some form, 2 million needing intensive help. Yet only 500,000 are receiving help in any form.

The basis to mental health and emotional stability are laid during the early years. A quality program can be a therapeutic milieu in itself, supportive of the child's growth and development, and can offer preventive mental health.

We must support the ability of parents to parent; and we must supplement and assume that responsibility through the provision of day care, as grandmothers, uncles, aunts, and friends of a less mobile society did in other generations.

I do not want to oversell day care, as Headstart was oversold in the beginning. Headstart was a part-day, part-year program with limited goals, and its planners did not expect that it would be able to overcome the developmental deficits which had accumulated over several years. No program, no matter how good, can do that in a few months. But children who are in a good program over an extended period of time, can be markedly helped.

The message is that a quality program with continuity and emphasis on meeting the needs of each child and his family, can make a difference in the potential of many children, giving them the opportunity which has been the promise of America, to develop to the fullest.

Now let me turn from the "why" to the "how" of day care.

The primary recommendation which came out of forum 17 called for "consolidated Federal efforts through legislation and funding . . . to establish a diverse national network of comprehensive developmental child care services." Forum participants felt that the ultimate goal of such a network should be high quality care available to all children who need it and all families who seek it. There was a strong consensus that the need for such legislation was immediate.

The forum arrived at a consensus on what many of the elements of such legislation should be. I feel a number of them are particularly important to consider. When we call for a diverse national network of comprehensive developmental child-care services we are warning against a monolithic institution for children. No one type of program is right for all children. Programs should be designed for the varying needs of different children rather than children being molded to fit available programs.

Allowance should therefore be made for the establishment of a wide variety of programs including, where appropriate, group day care, family care, and home care; evening care, and emergency care; and covering all age groups from infants through school age.

All of these varying types of programs must, however, provide comprehensive services, including educational, nutritional, health and so-

cial services to assure each child the opportunity to grow and develop to his full potential.

Any comprehensive child-care legislation must provide for the integrated development of all aspects of the program. Thus, not only are funds needed for operating programs, but also for planning, training, and technical assistance; facility construction and renovation; research and development; and evaluation and monitoring.

Most basic is the need for adequate funding of child-care programs. To date, no proposal has been introduced which would provide adequate resources to meet but a tiny fraction of the need. The most ambitious proposals call for $2 billion and $4 billion a year.

Contrasted with the present $400–$500 million which the Federal Government is investing in child-care programs, this would constitute a substantial jump and is therefore an acceptable point of departure.

But, we must not lose sight of the vast numbers of children in need of services when we talk about future years. Appropriations must continue to be increased until all children who need services are served.

Let us look for a moment at what we can realistically hope to accomplish with $2 billion. Assuming a conservative annual cost of $2,000 per preschool child per year, we could service 1 million children across the country, with $4 billion, an additional 1 million.

There are, however, an estimated 3–4 million children under 5 years of age living in poverty. There are an estimated 5 million children under 5 years of age whose mothers work. There are additional millions of school age children whose mothers work. The 2.7 million working female heads of families alone have 3.8 million children.

While an accurate estimate of necessary resources will not be available until we know exactly how many children need what kind of care and better cost figures are available, a better guess at necessary appropriations levels is around $30 billion.

Any system which is devised for providing child-care services must insure parents a decisive role in the planning, operation, and evaluation of programs in which their children participate. The parents and the community should decide which programs they want for their children, what the goals of these programs shall be and what the curriculum shall be. In too many programs we have been told what is best for us, what we shall have.

I would submit that parents and the community are in the best position to assess their own needs and make decisions based on that assessment. Further, parent control of programs is probably the best mechanism through which to insure that programs will be of high quality and will enhance and support family life, supplementing the family rather than substituting for the family.

While we are building a universally available system, some decisions will have to be made as to who shall be served first while services and facilities remain limited. At the same time, a system which builds a program integrated racially, economically, and culturally must be provided.

I believe that both of these ends can be achieved in whatever system we build in this country. First, child-care programs must be separated from the welfare system. The White House Forum felt so strongly about this that a separate resolution was passed on the floor emphasizing this report point—they must not be developed in order

to lessen public assistance roles but rather as a basic right—all children who need child care should be able to avail themselves of the same services, regardless of their family's economic status.

The level of funding will in large part determine the ability of this country to mount developmental programs, as opposed to custodial programs. A decision must be made that the policy carried out in day care programs is one of individual attention to children's needs through a developmental approach, enhancing a child's social, emotional and cognitive development in program content. The key to our determination to provide children with developmental care will be the level of funding, and key to that is the quality of personnel to whom we entrust the care of our Nation's most precious resource.

Personnel is what makes for a good program, as a teacher who is warm, knowledgeable, emotionally healthy herself can then relate to the child and establish the program which offers the child challenge and security.

The respect in which a teacher is held by the society is largely demonstrated by our willingness to pay an adequate salary. All legislation gives lipservice to development care, but it is not possible to buy it, for example, especially with the rising costs which will be associated with program expansion, for what the FAP estimate would allow.

The level proposed in Senator Mondale's bill would allow us to begin to establish quality care for a large number of children. I cannot support that strongly enough as a good beginning.

Second, when determining eligibility for publicly supported services, first priority must go to children and families in greatest need, "whether the need be economic, physical, emotional or social."

I believe that, for the purposes of day care at least, economic need should be redefined. It is difficult to imagine that any family of four with an income of $3,700 could begin to have flexible money in its budget to pay for the costs of child care.

A more realistic income level at which parents could begin paying for services on a sliding scale would be above the level of income defined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics as the lower living standard budget. Priority for services should go to those children of single-parent families and children of working mothers who, clearly, are in great need of services. Special consideration in the program must also be given to migrant and Indian children to assure that they, too, will be served.

It is difficult to visualize what all these provisos and conditions mean in terms of the individual child, especially where we have been talking not of hundreds of thousands but of millions of boys and girls.

Let me draw a couple of verbal pictures for you of what is happening to some of our youngsters. Of the 20,000 or so under age 6 who are left with no one at all to look after them, some mothers, working because of economic necessity, pin tags to their clothes, hoping that, if they stray away, some kind person will guide them home before the end of the day.

In another State, North Carolina, an elderly woman and a mentally retarded child are in charge of 15 babies a year old. Not able to keep their diapers changed, much less to cope with their developmental

needs, these custodians keep the blinds pulled down. In this, one of the most important growing periods of life and learning, the babies vegetate. It is what we call "zoo care."

In my own State of Maryland, a child whose mother works is left in the care of her grandmother. Children cared for by relatives are generally considered to be in good hands—but this grandmother is an alcoholic. At times, dear and loving; at other times, a tyrant.

Mary was turning into a shadow of her former self, afraid to say or do anything for fear of arousing her grandmother's temper. Fortunately, a day-care center was found, and after a number of months, she began to come out of her shell, to explore, to relate to people, to develop the security each child needs.

In some inner cities, it is generally accepted that "the sick, the elderly, and the winos are the ones who care for the children." These are just a few examples of some of the injustices which this country allows to happen to our youngsters, injustices which taint their development and their lives.

What I and many other concerned Americans are talking about when we mention child care is an end to certain traditionally accepted but in the final analysis primitive modes of dealing with our progeny.

These are the hard questions.

Do we want our children to have all the benefits of what the behavioral scientists have discovered to be best for them or do we remain in a season of our past, our covered wagon pioneer days?

Do we really want to continue to think of child care as a gum-chewing teen-age baby sitter who watches our children without thought or concern or expert knowledge?

Do we want to still consider child care as children in basement rooms staring at television for most of a day that, under expert guidance, could have been a day of the joy of growth and learning?

Do we want to keep vital, energetic women who happen also to be mothers focused in the constant care of their children with no relief for either child or mother and no supplemental asistance to help them to do what all parents want for their children: to help them become as complete, as splendid and as total a human being as their potential would allow.

Do we want to invest in our young as we have invested in going to the moon? We have said we could get there in 10 years, and we did. We can do the same for our children if we apply the American energy, resources, commitment, and funds to the goal of nurturing our children and helping their families.

I do want to emphasize the number of children needing day care. The 1961 Census Bureau survey which was done at the request of the Women's Bureau and the Children's Bureau found that, at that time—the number has increased greatly since then—there were 12 million children under 14 whose mothers were working.

Incidentally, I would like to menton here there is a serious need for study money to get the statistics together. From that study, for example, we didn't have information about the wage of the mother and how many children she had and what age correlated.

We had it separately but unless it is all correlated it is difficult to relate it to a community and to do your planning on the basis of

that. It means that many communities have to start with the basic thing of going and surveying their communtiy whereas we should be able to get that information as a result of this census recently taken. It does require some money to pull the figures together.

Of the 12 million children, 8 percent or nearly 1 million were being left with no one at all to look after them, including 20,000 under 6 years of age being left totally by themselves. Another nearly 1 million were being left in inadequate care with a neighbor down the street, a sibling school age or sometimes below school age being kept at home to take care of younger children, and sometimes being left in unlicensed centers or even in centers which in some States are licensed solely for physical qualifications of the facility and do not have anything that pertains to program quality.

Another million and a half mothers take their children to work with them so this 3½ million children who in 1965 were in desperate need of day-care services as of that moment, the children who are being actually damaged by this lack, apart from so many of the other needs the 4 million children who exist in economically deprived circumstances under the age of 5.

There are a lot of statistics that you can throw in here but I just want to emphasize that we feel that in no community is more than 20 percent of the need being met and in most communities it is between 5 and 10 percent, so we have an enormous gap waiting immediately.

The fact is that our statistics emphasize only the working women and don't examine the other children who need care such as the child with handicaps or the family with handicaps, and there are a number of these situations in which having the child in a program could be extremely helpful.

It would avoid institutionalization or foster care which is much more expensive emotionally as well as financially for this family and for society and for the child.

The Joint Commission on Mental Health for Children estimates that nearly 10 million children, they were talking in terms of children under the age of 4 because there are 95 million of those, but nearly 10 million under those ages need help in some form, yet only 500,000 of these are receiving care or help of any kind. Day care which is in itself a therapeutic when it is properly done can help to prevent some of the emotional and social problems that develop in young children.

Senator MONDALE. We recently had a national conference on child development efforts and I am surprised by the number of professionals who express the concern on the point you just made, that namely if we develop such a program we should develop it step by step on a quality basis and not spread the funds so thinly that little is accomplished.

We should have high standards, we should have good funding and not just spread the funds to say we are serving more because we may be providing a disservice to those children. There should be some protection, some guarantee, that these programs be at an acceptable level.

Mrs. LANSBURGH. I do think it is extremely important that we do have standards and maintain standards.

Senator MONDALE. My point is we have some conceptions of what it will cost, and I can visualize appropriating say, enough money for 90,000 kids and someone will say, "Oh, my goodness. Let's spread it

and just help all of them a little, let's spread it so a little money goes to a lot of children."

But the kind of care they receive will be so inadequate as to be almost useless. In fact, it may separate children from the parents and in fact hurt the family and destroy the credibility of the program.

Mrs. LANSBURGH. That is a very good point. I think that there is some disagreement among the professionals. What is the point at which it is better to have no program at all than to have a program which is inadequately funded? There is some level on that continuum and that has not been finally determined.

Senator MONDALE. In the first year of title I, the school district receiving help received about $250 a child—that was in 1965. Today I think the average is something like $85 because it has spread so widely. When you figure the inflation from 1965 to now actually it does not even approach the deflated value of the dollar. And then people come up and say title I does not work. Then you can't get public support.

Mrs. LANSBURGH. I do think that we can now lower our standards to the point where it is going to damage children and I think this is one of the things that was concerning a great number of us about the proposal in the Federal Child Care Corporation which was that there would be a national standard proposed which were really quite minimum.

Senator MONDALE. Do you think there is some skill that is needed in selling chicken that makes you automatically gifted in the preschool situation?

Mrs. LANSBURGH. Many children who are in some of those 640,000 spaces are being damaged today, even though they are licensed. A study was done in Europe that 90 percent of the programs that were licensed in New York City were not really good programs in the way they should be. So that we have that problem in addition to creating new programs.

I think that we need licensing combined with monitoring in a sense of trying to help the people who are running the center to upgrade their standards where they are, for example, what we call the "Mom and Poppa" centers, who are trying very hard because of their interest and concern for children. They are taking really a lesser income than the income they could get if they were, for example, working for a school, in order to remain in the day-care center and they really want to have children but have not been able to because they don't have the skill or the funds.

These people are caught in the squeeze between the rising price and the fact that parents won't and largely are not able to pay any more. So they are in a very difficult bind there, too.

I think this is one of the reasons that we strongly advocated as a forum the sliding scale of support payments from the Government to help the parents who are above the level of assistance and who get full care for their children paid for but who are still not able to swing it themselves in paying for a full-day's care.

I do strongly support your proposal of raising the level so that we aren't considering the poverty level at the point at which full pay is offered for the care that is given to children.

Senator MONDALE. In our bill we set a new level of $6,900 on the grounds that such families do need this. Also we try to do everything

we can to take away the welfare image. We hear so many complaints about Headstart, from mothers whose children need it but who are reluctant to put their children in because it is "welfare" and they don't want "welfare"—they want an education.

Mrs. LANSBURGH. Of course, this has been one of the real stumbling blocks that day care has encountered, the fact that it was considered a program for deviate and disturbed and economically disadvantaged children.

The concept is the same as what the middle class has been using in the kindergarten and nursery school. So we should try to create the kind of public climate where there is a recognition that day care is the same kind of developmental program as other programs which have been traditionally used.

The forum felt extremely strongly about the fact that we should not have day care tied in to welfare legislation partly because of this point and also because of the fact that it would promote racial and economic segregation in a way that we feel would be detrimental to children.

We even felt so strongly about this that a special resolution on this point was passed from the floor in addition to being included in the entire overall recommendations.

I would like to mention training because I think that quality as we have been discussing it is intimately tied in with the quality of the personality work of children. The forum recommended 50,000 spaces per year be added as a result of Federal support to institutions of learning and to service training programs. This is really, I think, a drop in the bucket.

I have since read an estimate that there are currently 300,000 spaces for teachers which are available and for which teachers are not properly trained. As Dr. Kagan was mentioning we don't feel that all people need to have a college degree but we do feel that there has to be some kind of teacher training that will qualify them so that they know about child growth and development, what to expect of a child at a certain age, what is a child saying by his behavior that holds up a red flag and says that this child maybe needs special attention, or I should refer this child to the social worker psychologist.

What is there in the resources of the community which can be called in to supplement the program that we have so the child can benefit and how do we react with the child so that training becomes extremely important. The money for operating programs is crucial.

I think that one of the most important things is continuity so that programs are not feeling like next week or next month the money for this program is going to be cut off. It is very difficult to work under those circumstances. I think it is detrimental to the teachers and detrimental to the quality of the program.

This is in addition, of course, to maintaining a level and to recognizing that in this sphere as in any other you are going to have the problem of annual increments for teachers and teacher self-respect, I think, has a great deal to do with how the teacher is able to relate to and work with the children.

I would like to close with a few specific examples because we have been talking in such astronomical numbers of children that it is hard

to bring it down to thinking in terms of the individual child who is being damaged and hurt by the lack of developmental child care.

I think particularly of a place in North Carolina where the children were a year old and incidentally there is a tremendous increase in the number of preschool children whose mothers are working. This seems to really have accelerated during the last 5 years.

As my niece said today, you go to work whether you have graduated from college and get married or not; and in my day when you graduated from college and got married most women didn't go to work. Today they do and they keep on working when their children are small.

In North Carolina there were these 15 babies being cared for by an elderly woman and a mentally retarded child. In order to keep up with the children, keep them from being too much of a bother, these two women could not even keep the diapers changed so they kept the blinds pulled down and these children just stay there and vegetated during one of the most important periods of life. We call that "zoo care."

In the inner cities it is generally accepted that the sick, the elderly, and the winos are usually the people who care for children. I think what we are doing is creating a real injustice to our children. In fact, this country allows this kind of neglect to happen and turns its face the other way. We have to overcome the sociological lag that exists and decide whether we want to invest in our young as we invested in going to the moon. We said we would be there in 10 years and everyone thought it was an impossibility, but we did it.

We can do the same for American children if we apply the commitment and the resources and the energy and funds to the goal of nurturing our children to the development of their full potential.

I would be glad to answer any questions.

Senator MONDALE. Thank you for your most helpful statement and particularly for your work with the White House Conference and the work of your organization.

Senator Taft?

Senator TAFT. I wonder if you would address yourself somewhat to the first question that I asked Dr. Kagan this morning, particularly with regard to how you suggest that we handle the racial problem in this connection.

Were you thinking about the same approach as in our public schools, or are you thinking differently, or did you really get down to facing up to this one?

Mrs. LANSBURGH. I feel very strongly that integration where it is at all possible, and there are some areas where it is extremely difficult to manage, is preferable. I am talking about economic integration as well as the racial integration.

I think one of the fears that a lot of middle-class families have is that if this program is going to be so good for the child who has not had the same developmental opportunities as their own children, as the Coleman report pointed out, and emphasized that children from deprived backgrounds did much better in a school setting when they were integrated with children who had higher IQ and had a goal in life which many of these children did not have.

They have been afraid that their children might fall back as a result of being in with these other children but the diversity is really an asset as Caldwell has shown in one of her studies.

Senator TAFT. I think that is true, but the practical problems in some ways are worse. For instance, there is the question of transportation. Did you talk about the transportation problems at all?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, Senator. I think you may want to take a look at what really is. The question of geographical location that ethnic groups appear in the United States may very well testify to the fact that in the areas of black control, which are beginning to develop in Newark and Cleveland, that the demand of parents in black organizations representing that constituency ought to be very sharply adhered to if we are talking about a democracy and the control of institutions by people who get the service.

I think that better organizations principally stand behind that principle, that the question of integration as it affects those who want to be integrated ought to be adhered to, that should not be a blanket imposition on units of ethnic concentration who by the very nature of the geography want to be related to that general culture and that general historical evolvement which is so much a part of American history.

Senator TAFT. The next question then is, do the Supreme Court cases relating to schools apply to day care and if not, why isn't title VI involved if you are talking about Federal money?

Mr. TAYLOR. I think so, I think you have two questions here. I think you have the question of the attempts on the part of several States in the United States to use the question of color to circumvent quality and equality. That, I think, is the question.

I think there is another question that certainly relates to the independence of various ethnic groups who reside in other parts of the United States that must be taken into account also. I don't think they are mutually exclusive. I think it merely depends upon what area you are talking about and what ends you wish to achieve.

Mrs. LANSBURGH. Does the local community have its own right of self-determination and what do they want, I think that is really the answer to the question. In my mind, because it is what the parents working in the form of the board and working together to determine what is the policy of the program who will determine the specific answer to that question, if you really give control to the local group.

Senator TAFT. In your statement you talk about need for parental and community control. You also stated on page 12 that first priority should be given to children in the greatest need. In view of this, do you feel that national guidelines for eligibility will be necessary or beneficial?

Mrs. LANSBURGH. It is going to be a tremendous problem because, as the forum delineated, we didn't say just economic need, we meant need as determined by the economic, social, emotional, and psychological needs of children, and physical needs of children. All of these things are part of the determination of need.

You have a child who is seriously handicapped and his family may be just as needy as a child who comes from an economically deprived home. So we felt that all of these areas would require the judgment of a Solomon in determining how you are going to allocate the first dollars.

But, I think again if the community as has been delineated in Senator Mondale's bill, if the community is a part of a larger community and then makes that determination themselves, and if the parents are adequately represented in that council, that determination should be made following these lines but without allocating a segment for this and a segment for that.

Senator TAFT. I have just one other question. Have you in your studies and discussions gotten into the possible uses of teaching machines and computer uses and training, either of the children themselves with special TV programs or in the teaching and training of the people who are going to be in charge?

Mrs. LANSBURGH. We haven't seriously considered it as a possibility for training the teachers and I think training the trainers is of first priority. As far as the children themselves are concerned, I really do not see the value of machines for children except with the possible exception of the typewriter which allows children to teach themselves.

Senator TAFT. What ages are you talking about? Are you talking about children below 6 years old, now?

Mrs. LANSBURGH. I think the crucial thing with very young children is the human relationship and I think it is extremely important to have a low staff-child ratio and I don't feel the use of the machine is important. It is the ability of the individual teacher to relate to that child, to understand what his particular needs and capabilities and stage of development are and what his interests are and then to relate that to his chronological age and where he should be going and what he needs to do and gradually developing the program which answers his need and gives him the joy of learning.

A machine can't do that. I think that the television that has been developed by Sesame Street has been an exciting program but it is not needed as an adjunct to a good quality day-care program.

It is very good for the children who are not in such a program but within such a program hopefully they will be able to adjust the program to the individual needs of each child, if this is what you are referring to. But I don't see machines with very young children.

I have some difficulty with children in the elementary school, too, but that is a personal feeling about them. I think they can be used but we have to be sure there is that human element. Children learn from people and from doing and not from hearing somebody say do as I say, but from doing it themselves and from exploring and developing the wheel themselves, in a sense.

Senator TAFT. Thank you very much.

Senator MONDALE. We are most grateful to you for your excellent testimony. We hope as the work of this committee progresses both you and your organization will continue to be of assistance to us and send us information and suggestions.

Mrs. LANSBURGH. Senator Mondale, did you ask a question about the 4(c) program. If you would like me to speak to that, I will. I feel strongly having worked with this in my own home community where there is the problem of all the various agencies that are concerned with children who have been going off and doing things in a splinter fashion. There is the possibility always of two centers being built side by side because the Department of Education and the Department of Welfare may be planning to meet the need in that particular community.

67-582 O—71——7

I saw great need for the 4(c) program when it was first developed and our agency was initially the contracting agent for that program. We are not any longer. We feel that this is a tremendously important step in the right direction. It is a terribly difficult process to mount because of the fact that there are all of the territorial imperatives that obtain for human beings as well as for animals, that we all want to protect our own turf, so there is difficulty in this.

There is also the problem of funding, because in order to obtain a really functioning organization as the 4(c) organization for local and State and regional levels, there must be funds, there must be staff.

It doesn't happen without somebody there making it happen. This has been another difficulty of the 4(c) program. I think that in some communities in larger cities it is almost impossible to get a 4(c) group going and actually covering the entire city.

Perhaps we will need to divide that into small groups. But I do see tremendously important need for the coordination and cooperation. I have had an instance of this just this past week in my own community where I had somebody from one agency and somebody from another have lunch with me and in the process of the discussion we found out about a building that one of us had heard about from a fourth person who was not even there.

The Model Cities Agency was looking for a site to put a day-care center in that particular area and didn't know this building was available. This is the kind of thing that coordination can help us do and also it is extremely important in the process of planning where the center is going to go and who is going to have the responsibility for the opportunities to develop that program.

Senator MONDALE. Thank you very much.

We stand in recess until call of the Chair. Thank you very, very much.

(Whereupon, at 11:55 a.m., the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene subject to call of the Chair.)

APPENDIX

Selected Excerpts from the White House Conference on Children

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN
REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT
(Selected Excerpts)

PREAMBLE

Preamble

As we begin this significant national reassessment, let us remind ourselves of our purpose.

This should be a Conference about love . . . about our need to love those to whom we have given birth . . . and those who are most helpless and in need . . . and those who give us a reason for being . . . and those who are most precious for themselves—for what they are and what they can become. Our children.

Let us ask what we want for our children. Then let us ask not less for all children.

We want for our children a home of love and understanding and encouragement.

We want for our children a full opportunity for learning in an environment in which they can reach and grow and take pride in themselves.

We want for our children the right to be healthy, to be free of sickness. But if sickness comes, to have the best care humanly possible.

We want for our children the right to have the respect of others. We want them to have respect and dignity as a *right* because they are, not because of who their parents are.

We want for our children to live under laws that are fair and just and that are administered fairly and justly.

We want for our children to love their country because their country has earned their love, because their country strives to create peace and to create the conditions of a humane and healthy society for all of its citizens and is dedicating the resources necessary to redeem its commitment to these ends.

This we want for our children. Therefore this we must want for *all* children. There can be no exceptions.

To those who have food, it is intolerable that there is a child somewhere in our land who is ill-nourished.

To those who live beneath a sound roof, it is intolerable that there should be a child who is ill-housed and without adequate clothes.

That we are well, so then is it intolerable that a child is needlessly sick or lives in an environment that poisons his body or mind.

That we have the knowledge, so then is it intolerable that there is some child who does not have a full opportunity to learn.

That we are a Nation founded on equality, so must we not tolerate intolerance in ourselves or our fellows.

We must recognize that there is some child in special need. And he especially must be our child.

At a time when it is all too easy to accuse, to blame, to fault, let us gather in trust and faith to put before the Nation that which is necessary and best.

All this we say with the greatest sense of urgency and conviction. Our children and our families are in deep trouble. A society that neglects its children and fears its youth cannot care about its future. Surely this is the way to national disaster.

Our society has the capacity to care and the resources to act. Act we must.

There is a need to change our patterns of living so that once again we will bring adults back into the lives of children and children back into the lives of adults.

The changes must come at all levels of society—in business, industry, mass media, schools, government, communities, neighborhoods, and, above all, in ourselves. The changes must come *now*.

We as Delegates to the 1970 White House Conference on Children do now affirm our *total commitment* to help bring our Nation into a new age of caring. Now we begin.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN
REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT
(Selected Excerpts)

Letter of Transmittal
from Stephen Hess

The President
The White House
Washington, D. C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

On December 5, 1969, when you appointed me as National Chairman of the White House Conference on Children and Youth, you stated:

Never has this White House Conference come at a time of greater national questioning. Long held attitudes on such subjects as family planning, pornography, health services, school curricula, sex education, family structure, drug abuse, moral standards, governance of higher education, responsiveness of government—all are now openly challenged and debated.

The White House Conference can and will define problems, seek new knowledge, evaluate past success and failure, and outline alternative courses of action.

I believe that this report, which I am pleased to transmit to you, demonstrates how well the Children's Conference met this challenge. But the accomplishments and the lessons of the Children's Conference are not all reflected in this report. Therefore, in addition to stating what I believe to be important themes of this document, I would like to take this opportunity to relate a number of other unique aspects of the Conference.

First, the design. One of our earliest decisions was to separate the children and the youth phases of the Conference. Our purpose was to give both children and youth the time and attention they so much need. While all young people are affected by certain common factors, there are numerous areas where age is a critical element. This has long been reflected in our social institutions and our laws, which usually distinguish between the child and the adolescent. But today the differences have become even more pronounced, with youth becoming more and more concerned with what was once considered the adult domain of public affairs, while children still live in their own special world. We were determined not to let this important children's world become secondary because of the greater attention currently being paid to youth.

Hence, we decided to hold a Children's Conference (ages 0–13) in December 1970 and a Youth Conference (ages 14–24) in April 1971. It is my firm belief that it will no longer be realistic for future planners to hold a single Conference for both groups.

Next, our approach to the Children's Conference. From your mandate, several things became evident. For one, a significant amount of pre-Conference study was needed if we truly were to "define problems, seek new knowledge" and "evaluate past success and failure." Certainly such a considerable task could not adequately be accomplished by 4,000 people suddenly brought together for a brief week in Washington.

Second, the Conference had to be *multi-disciplinary* bringing together social scientists and clergymen, educators and businessmen, health practitioners and lawyers, parents, media representatives, children and many others to work together toward solving the many related and overlapping problems affecting children. It had

5

to break down organizational and professional barriers that have prevented open discussion and cooperation in the past.

Finally, the delegates could not merely be passive observers at massive sessions where experts read their papers. If they were to carry home new insights into children's lives, new motivations, new desires for cooperation among disciplines, the delegates had to be active participants in the Conference. Thus we had to develop new Conference techniques—visits to institutions dealing with children; the use of such media as films to capture children in their own surroundings; the creation of smaller, inter-disciplinary discussion groups; the involvement of delegates in situations similar to those encountered by children. The Conference had to become a learning process, with the child as the central focus.

With all of these factors in mind, we began our extensive pre-Conference work. In early January of 1970, we started to collect ideas from around the country on what specific issues the Children's Conference should explore—defining the problems. Regional meetings with state leaders were held in Atlanta, Chicago and San Francisco as well as in Washington. There were one- to three-day conferences with experts in such fields as health, law, education and nutrition. In the course of several months, more than 1,500 individual suggestions were received.

With these in hand, the task of synthesizing—of setting priorities, of placing the suggestions into a workable context—was given to five staff members: an educator, a lawyer, a dentist, a sociologist, and a psychologist specializing in early child development. In many ways, the experiences of this group were a model for the Conference plan. Here were professionals, who, because of differences in training and experience, held different ideas as to what should be included in the Conference. Clearly, if they were unable to resolve their differences, to go beyond their own disciplines, the prospects for a multi-disciplinary Conference were poor. Needless to say, they did have disagreements. But through some process, which even they cannot explain, they began to work together as a team. Pet theories and professional jargon were kept to a minimum. Emphasis was placed not on the needs and desires of the various professionals, but on the needs of the child.

On Wednesday, April 1, 1970, we brought together an outstanding group from all disciplines to review our tentative plans. They were asked to identify omissions and to point out where too much emphasis was being placed. Although they were enthusiastic about the overall concept and content, they did have some reservations. We went back to the drawing boards and made additional revisions.

So, after more than three months of listening, thinking, arguing and revising, a plan for an exciting White House Conference on Children emerged. The Conference was divided into the following seven areas and 26 forums:

Individuality:

1. "I'm Me." (A film made by children.)
2. Emergence of Identity: The First Years.
3. Expressions of Identity: The School-Age Child.
4. Crisis in Values.

Learning:

5. The Future of Learning: Into the Twenty-first Century.
6. Creativity and the Learning Process.
7. The Right to Read.
8. Confronting Myths of Education.
9. Educational Technology: Constructive or Destructive?

Health:	10. Keeping Children Healthy: Health Protection and Disease Prevention. 11. Making Children Healthy: Delivery of Health Care Services. 12. Children Who Are Handicapped. 13. Children Who Are Injured.
Parents and Families:	14. Changing Families in a Changing Society. 15. Children and Parents: Together in the World. 16. Family Planning and Family Economics. 17. Developmental Child Care Services.
Communities and Environments:	18. Children Without Prejudice. 19. "It's All Where You Live:" Children and Their Physical and Social Environments. 20. Child Development and the Mass Media. 21. The Child and Leisure Time.
Laws, Rights and Responsibilities:	22. The Rights of Children. 23. Children in Trouble: Alternatives to Delinquency, Abuse and Neglect. 24. The Child Advocate. 25. About the Law: Communicating the Law's Message to Children.
Child Service Institutions:	26. Child Service Institutions: Meeting the Needs of the Seventies.

The next step was to select members for the 24 pre-Conference forums which we created. Again, the goal was to bring together people representing a variety of skills, experiences, philosophies and constituencies. The 16 members of each forum had a number of critical tasks. It was they, who, with the Conference staff aid, had to seek the new knowledge. It was they who had to evaluate past success and failure. It was they who had to distill this information in preliminary working papers prepared for the Conference delegates. And it was they who had the difficult job of developing special presentations to give delegates added insight into their areas of concern.

I would like to say that, despite serious time and financial constraints, prior non-Conference commitments, and, on the part of some, apprehension about the value of such undertakings, the nearly 400 forum members performed their tasks extraordinarily well. They searched for new information in a variety of settings, from classroom to commune. To better understand how children feel, many of them met with children themselves. Still others experimented with new programs to test innovative approaches to their work. They were encouraged to share their observations and ideas with many citizens as they went about developing their papers.

They also created striking presentations that produced excellent conference by-products—films, records, booklets. For example, the *Future of Learning* forum developed a multi-media presentation on "Learning in the 21st Century," using laser beams, nine screens, and a live actor. The forum on *Confronting Myths of Education* produced a recording of various national leaders speaking on education. The forum on *Children and the Mass Media* held televised hearings on the effect of the media on children. The *Children in Trouble* forum made several films showing conditions in juvenile institutions and including interviews with doctors, judges, lawyers and custodians.

While the forums were conducting their work, many other innovative activities were being undertaken as part of the Conference process:

The Library of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare prepared *An Annotated Bibliography on Children*, which was coded by Conference subject areas and distributed to interested groups.

The Office of Education developed for the use of Conference participants 34 brochures describing model programs in childhood education.

Largely through the efforts of the representatives of 32 Federal agencies, we were able to publish *Profiles of Children*, a comprehensive and widely praised reference work.

After a systematic analysis of hundreds of films, the Conference organized several programs of films by, for, and about children, and published *World of Children*, an annotated listing of outstanding children's films and of where they can be obtained.

In cooperation with the Music Educators National Conference, we produced "The Sounds of Children," an exciting production of music and dance by youngsters from all over the Nation, which was filmed for network television viewing.

A series of six background papers by experts on such subjects as nutrition, the status of minority group children and day care was commissioned and distributed to Conference delegates working in the appropriate areas.

A unique souvenir program was designed to give a "child's-eye view" of the Conference subject areas through original artwork, essays and poetry by children themselves.

The close working relationship between the State Committees and the Conference staff resulted in the publication of a *Directory of State Committees, Councils, and Commissions on Children and Youth*. Many state committees also held conferences involving thousands of people (44,000 in Missouri and 24,000 in Pennsylvania, for example), and their reports were often of considerable help to those writing forum papers.

A Technical Assistance Committee, consisting of representatives from national organizations, and a Business-Industry Council each met several times to assist the staff in planning the Conference.

The National Chairman held informal weekly meetings with Washington-area school children, and transcripts of these sessions were made available to forum chairmen.

A one-hour television briefing was produced by Washington's WETA through a grant from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and aired at least once by all Public Television stations during the week prior to the Conference.

An imaginative Exhibition Hall was arranged for the Conference, featuring materials, equipment and programs dealing with child care, education, recreation and health.

8

At the same time, the Conference staff was directing the complex

SOF
191

task of delegate selection, taking pains to insure that the 4,000 persons invited would be representative of virtually all groups in the Nation. The delegates would have to come from all sections of the country. Twenty percent would have to be youth. At least twenty percent would have to be from minority groups. Instructions regarding adequate representation of all groups were sent to the Nation's governors and to voluntary national organizations, which together did the actual selecting of the majority of delegates. Each state was allowed to choose a basic 11 delegates, plus two more for each seat it holds in the United States House of Representatives. Thus Wyoming, with one Congressional seat, had 13 delegates, while California, with 38 seats, had 87 delegates.

The delegates were asked to state their preferences for forum assignments. Their preferences were then matched with the demographic balance desired for each forum, in line with the inter-disciplinary approach to the Conference; efforts were made to avoid putting all medical professionals on the health forums or all educators on the learning forums. In a majority of cases, it was possible to assign delegates to the forums which had been their first choices.

Meantime, the pre-Conference groups completed their working papers. These were printed and mailed to the delegates so that, upon arriving in Washington, they would be more familiar with the subjects they would be dealing with at the Conference. The proposals in the working papers were by no means meant to be the final recommendations of the Conference. Rather, they served as an essential starting point for the deliberations of the delegates, who would fashion the ultimate recommendations.

At the Conference, the methods chosen by the forums to involve delegates as participants were often highly innovative and sometimes even startling. For example, Forum #3 (Expressions of Identity: The School-Age Child) built an "environment" out of cardboard, dowels, pulleys and other materials in which the delegates held their meetings. This was part of its efforts to have the delegates shed their real identities—including their names, their professional credentials and other characteristics—and simulate as nearly as possible the manner in which a child's identity is formed.

Similarly, at a meeting of Forum #18 (Children Without Prejudice), an Iowa elementary school teacher segregated the forum members by eye color, providing "the blue-eyed people" with humiliating experiences and "the brown-eyed people" with preferential treatment, thereby surfacing the less admirable aspects of human nature.

Other forums visited facilities related to their work. One group went to Washington's Junior Village and filmed conditions there. Some visited local schools. Others went to the hospitals to observe the treatment of children. These techniques, I believe, helped give delegates a sense of deep involvement in the work of the Conference, and in the lives of children.

During the Conference, it became apparent that some delegates were concerned with issues that went beyond the scope of any individual forum. These participants felt it was necessary to give visibility to problems of a more national dimension and also to focus upon the unique needs of children in specific groups. In short, some felt, rightly or wrongly, that the Conference was not dealing with "the real issues."

I concluded that it was proper and correct for the Conference to give *official* recognition to those groups that could show by a simple petition mechanism that they represented a portion of the delegate body, and to give these "official caucuses" the same rights as the Conference forums: meeting rooms, logistical support, a place on the Conference ballot, an opportunity to state their case in a film made at the Conference and shown at the concluding sessions, and representation on the platform at these final sessions.

That minority groups might choose to organize caucuses is not in itself unique. But to my mind what is worth noting is that here we had a *coalition* of minority groups seeking to work within the framework of the Conference if given the opportunity. When that opportunity was provided, their efforts contributed to the success of the Conference. Perhaps this experience can serve as a model of how people holding different views and representing different constituencies can come together in pursuit of resolving problems.

From the forums and caucuses came 16 statements of "overriding concern," which were placed on a ballot. Every delegate was given the opportunity to rank these propositions in order of importance. (It should be noted that in a number of instances, caucus recommendations were similar to those proposed by the forums.) Each of the 25 forums also was able to put one "specific recommendation" on the ballot, with those voting asked to select the six considered of highest priority. In this way, the full sanction of the White House Conference was given to a limited number of recommendations judged of most immediate importance to the Nation. (A complete list of these recommendations is included as a separate section of this report.)

It would be impossible to summarize in a brief passage the content and tenor of the many recommendations of the 1970 White House Conference on Children. Delegates were concerned with virtually every facet of life which affects our children. Still, it is of value, I believe, to attempt to identify the more salient themes which seems, at least to me, to be common to most of the Conference reports.

These reports, taken together, constitute a broad commentary on America—and a deeply disturbing one. They indict the Nation for vast neglect of its children. They challenge the proposition that ours is a child-centered society. Instead they say that the child—as far as our institutions and laws are concerned—is too often a forgotten American. As stated in one report:

. . . Our national rhetoric notwithstanding, the actual patterns of life in America today are such that children and families come last.

The reports strongly urge deep reforms at all levels of society—in the home, the school, the health system, the mass media, and local, state, and Federal government.

Generally the recommendations speak to the need for comprehensive programs. There is the feeling that for too long institutional provincialism has encouraged fragmentation and separatism among those who deal with children. As a result, there is unnecessary duplication of services, increased costs, competition for scarce resources and a lack of accountability. Along with the call for a comprehensive approach is a desire for locally-administered, community-controlled programs. But while local control is felt to be critical, the reports also stress the need for a child

advocacy agency in the Federal government. No matter what the content area, there is virtual consensus that we must establish some form of child advocate system, a recommendation previously made by the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children. In the words of one forum:

In view of the past history of the neglect of children, it is the belief of this forum that such an agency is necessary before other recommendations can be effectively implemented.

One essential ingredient of the proposed child advocate system and of the call for comprehensive programs is the emphasis on the need to bring families together as the primary focus of the child's life. One report remarks:

We call for a reordering of priorities at all levels of American society so that children and families come first.

Other similar statements stress both the importance of the family and the need to recognize that there is more than one type of American family.

The delegates felt that the basic foundation for a comprehensive family-centered program is an adequate family assistance program. The following statement by one forum is indicative of this sentiment:

Since family stability is essential to observance and demonstration of a healthy value system, we recommend . . . a comprehensive family assistance program based upon a family income standard that will assure reasonable economic security.

Early child development is yet another prevalent theme. Most experts agree that a large share of a child's mental growth takes place long before he enters school, and that society should help to enrich these early years. The forum studying educational technology, for example, proposes a commission to study the possibility of starting public education at age three or four. Another proposal—by the forum concerned with developmental child care services—asks the Federal government to commit $6 billion to $10 billion a year by 1980 to develop a nationwide network of supplementary child care services which, in effect, would guarantee quality child services for all.

The consensus was that changes must take place in virtually all of our social institutions if we are to meet the needs of our children. The forums expressed particular dissatisfaction with the institution of public education. Here it is highly significant that, unlike previous White House Conference reports, the emphasis now is on *qualitative* rather than *quantitative* aspects of education. As one of the learning forums noted:

Education has long been locked into a monolithic structure that has frustrated most fundamental efforts for change. We need to develop a wide range of new options and new programs within and parallel to the present system of public education. We need funds—massive funds—to develop and implement a variety of alternatives, but there are many alternatives that require little or no additional funds. Legislative exemptions from regulation and the imagination to free ourselves from the binding constraints of unexamined tradition can in themselves be combined to produce significant changes.

ED1

Another theme which runs throughout the reports is the call for an end to racial discrimination and recognition of the importance of cultural diversity. The call is for a reemphasis on cultural pluralism. Every social institution is asked to recognize both the importance of the individual and the uniqueness of his or her cultural heritage. Religious institutions, for example, are asked to "cultivate in their members a respect for the dignity of other persons, especially those whose race, religion, or economic status differ from their own." Another forum remarks:

Many children, effectively isolated from their cultural heritage by poverty, home environment, racial discrimination, and geography, do not develop pride in their heritages, and their feelings of identity remain vague and confused. These children need help in finding out who they are and where they come from.

These, then, are a few of the main thrusts of the conference recommendations. Accompanying them, as expressed in the forum Chairmen's preamble, is a strong sense of urgency—a feeling that we must act *now* if our society is to flourish. There is a consensus that our Nation does possess the resources and knowledge necessary to attain the goals proposed by the participants to this 1970 White House Conference on Children.

I have discussed to this point the concept, organization, and some themes of the 1970 White House Conference on Children. What must be added now is the *mood* of the participants. Obviously it is easier to list recommendations than to assess what people felt, their doubts and their aspirations, for themselves and the Conference. Yet we know these illusive factors are of considerable importance. In many ways the Conference may be a microscopic reflection of what is occurring in the larger society.

Many of the participants brought to Washington a deep unease. From the Conference deliberations one could sense that too many participants had encountered too many frustrations in their own daily activities. Since many of these people are constantly involved in social problems it is not surprising that at times they feel overwhelmed by the tasks they face. The problems are many and potential solutions often complex. There is the feeling that there is much to be done and too little in the way of time, resources and energy. I believe it is in part out of this personal sense of frustration and confusion that people look to the Federal Government: on the one hand, they look for guidance and for money; on the other, they look for a source to hold responsible for many local problems and frustrations.

Although there was general agreement at the Conference that our child- and family-serving institutions and agencies must work together more effectively, there was little agreement about how to accomplish this. To some degree this indecisiveness stems from an unwillingness on the part of professionals to consider abandoning or modifying their own particular approaches or institutions. Clearly, we have become a credential- and specialist-oriented society. While specialization does enhance knowledge in specific areas, it also tends to separate people who should be working closely with one another. There has been a proliferation of professional organizations. These organizations serve a valuable function in establishing standards, advocating beneficial policies and distributing information to their constituencies. At the same time this proliferation of specialities and agencies has led to jurisdictional disputes. The unfortunate outcome, in too many in-

stances, is that these groups jockey for position and power and the needs of children continue to go unfilled.

While I believe we did achieve a notable degree of cooperation and understanding among the diverse participants, the Conference made clear that there is a great need to bring professionals into closer contact with citizens; a great need to bridge the gap between local and State agencies; a great need for more systematic planning and cooperation between State and Federal agencies. Finally, there is a critical need for all of these groups to move beyond their relatively parochial concerns to deal with the many child-centered problems which persist in our society.

In this, the concluding portion of my letter, I would like to relate what I see as some of the implications of the 1970 White House Conference on Children for future White House Conferences.

First, I believe that the concept of the Big National Conference as we have come to know it may require reformulation if it is to serve as a truly effective device for communication and policy formulation. The first White House Conference on Children, convened by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1909, had 200 delegates; by the 1960 Conference the participants had grown to over 7,600. The 1970 Children's Conference was pared down to approximately 3,700 delegates, but this was in part made possible by holding a subsequent 1,500-delegate Youth Conference.

As these Conferences have grown, the logistics required are such that an inordinate amount of time, energy and funds have to be allocated to functions that contribute little to the quality or substance of the final product. (For example, a staff of 100 worked for over a full year to make the arrangements for the 1970 Conference, and the 1960 Conference was in preparation for two years.) By contrast, the Nation has invested relatively modest resources over the years in the development of commissions or other institutions at the State level upon whom we could rely for much of the implementation of Conference recommendations and for preparation of recommendations for subsequent national conferences.

I would, therefore, recommend that the Federal government encourage and support the efforts of State groups involved in the White House Conference process. The 1970 Conference generated many recommendations that can be implemented at the local level. And the White House Conference regional meetings—February 21–March 3, 1971, in five cities—have been geared to planning strategies for implementation at the State and local levels.

Primarily as a result of the 1950 and 1960 White House Conferences, every State now has a permanent or temporary organization concerned with the needs of children. These committees, councils or commissions often performed yeoman service, involving many thousands of people, in preparation for the 1970 national meeting, and many have shown a willingness and enthusiasm for following up on the recommendations made in Washington.

While it is hard to generalize on what factors make one State committee more successful than another—and often the difference between action and inaction can be traced largely to the involvement of a handful of dedicated volunteers or professionals—I would speculate that the greatest factors in success are: 1) a

statutory mandate; 2) strong backing from the governor's office; 3) a broad-based committee consisting of high-level representatives of the concerned State agencies, lay and professional organizations; 4) enlightened citizen involvement, including substantial participation by young people and minority group members; and 5) some full-time paid staff. The similarly structured committees in Illinois and Kentucky provide one useful model for other States to consider emulating. (*The Directory of State Committees, Councils, and Commissions on Children and Youth* provides a wealth of information on how these bodies are organized.)

In addition to such State committees, 10 States have Community Coordinated Child Care (4–C) committees recognized by governors. The Office of Child Development has supported the creation of 4–C groups, which are composed of parents, public and private service providers and professionals in the field of child care and development. Their activities typically have included surveying the needs of children and marshalling public and private resources to meet those needs. Many other 4–C committees are in the process of gaining State and local recognition, and such groups might also be considered the appropriate vehicle for conducting Conference-related activities at the State level.

It strikes me that one of the most immediately useful follow-up activities to the 1970 White House Conference would be for the National Council of State Committees for Children and Youth and 4–C committees to set up a subcommittee to review the organization of existing State bodies and to formulate *model legislation* that would be used to encourage every State to establish an effective and *permanent* "assessment of the status of children" commission, whose major functions would be: 1) to develop an accountability mechanism which would enable local communities to measure their needs and progress; 2) to seek to get implemented those programs and policies which would enhance the status of all children.

These commissions should be jointly funded from Federal, State and local resources. I would strongly recommend that consideration be given to providing funds to the States from the appropriation requested for the White House Conference on Children and Youth in the Fiscal Year 1972 Federal budget. This suggestion, in my opinion, is fully in accord with your philosophy of government, most recently enunciated in your 1971 State of the Union Message.

We know that States and communities vary in problems and resources. Strategies need not be similar in all cases. Through the State commissions, each locality could plan programs taking into consideration the uniqueness of its situation. Such an approach would also further cooperation among professional, volunteer, and local governmental organizations. Through the encouragement of such continuous efforts, citizens of every background could have more opportunity to make contributions and to see the fruits of their labors.

Our national capacity to serve children would be enhanced, in my view, if the state committees could be brought together on a workshop basis once a year. These annual White House Conferences on Children—smaller and more frequent than the decennial meetings—would provide an efficient and effective basis for communication; a current assessment of needs and resources, and

a useful evaluation of existing programs. The once-a-decade Conference might then be expanded in number, be given the special responsibility of assessing the progress made since the last national Conference, and be required to state clearly the priorities for the next decade.

The decennial White House Conference on Children is a venerable social institution in its own right and, with appropriate modifications, can continue to play a significant role in the development of national policy. To this end, the Director of the Office of Child Development and I are presently preparing a questionnaire to seek from those who attended the 1970 Conference their views on how to design a national conference format that could maximize opportunities for the production of useful recommendations and minimize the tendency on the part of some participants toward public posturing rather than dialogue with their co-workers.

At the same time, there is an urgent need for a national center for child advocacy within the Federal establishment. The Office of Child Development, which you created in 1969, is the ideal place to locate such a unit.

An advocacy center within OCD could serve a variety of functions, including 1) to act as a central source for the collection and dissemination of information; 2) to act as a technical assistance referral and resource center; 3) to assist in the development of national policies and programs; 4) to act as the national coordinating mechanism to convene the annual White House Conference on Children.

The rest of this document consists of the individual reports approved by the 25 Forums at the 1970 White House Conference on Children. It is my judgment that many of these recommendations are creative, innovative, and worthy of implementation. The most logical body to initiate a prompt government-wide review of these proposals and to call them to the attention of your Cabinet would be the Office of Child Development. Therefore, I would further propose that part of the White House Conference's Fiscal Year 1972 appropriations be used by OCD to create for one year within the proposed national center for child advocacy a group whose task would be to devise plans by which the highest priority recommendations of the 1970 White House Conference on Children may be implemented, and to ensure that responsibility for acting on such plans is clearly assigned to appropriate agencies of the Federal government, including the Office of Child Development.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I would like to thank you for this opportunity to try to serve our country in cooperation with thousands of dedicated Americans. I am indeed proud of the spirit and manner in which the 1970 White House Conference on Children has sought to fulfill your mandate.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen Hess
National Chairman

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN
REPORT OTO THE PRESIDENT
(Selected Excerpts)

Report of Forum 2
Emergency of Identity: The First Years

Intellectual Development

Early care exerts very powerful influences on a child. Existing studies indicate that, when deprived of early care, a child's development is almost always retarded—physically, intellectually, and socially.

The first years of life were investigated by Skeels in his "Iowa Studies" of the 1930's. Almost by chance Skeels discovered that two orphaned infants who had been personally cared for by mentally retarded adolescent girls showed unexpected spurts in development. Skeels and Dye then arranged a study in which retarded adolescent girls cared for 13 infants who were failing to thrive in an orphanage environment. At the time of transfer, the babies were about 19 months old and had a mean IQ of 64. A comparison group of 12 infants was found, averaging 16.6 months of age and having a mean IQ of 86.7. After an experimental period of 19 months, the children receiving personal attention from retarded adolescent girls showed an average IQ gain of 28.5 points, while the comparison group in the orphanage, after an average interval of 30.7 months, lost 26.2 IQ points. Skeels' work has been reinforced by Benjamin Bloom who also stressed the importance of the first years of life for intellectual development.

Our society, with its emphasis on power and wealth, has neglected its most valuable resource, children. Strangely, however, we have failed to count the cost of this neglect. In the Skeels study described above, the institutionalized children having primarily custodial care continued to cost society throughout their lives, while the similar children who experienced human affection during their early years lived outside institutions and became contributing members of society. In terms of 1963 money values, Skeels estimated that one case placed in the institution had cost the state $100,000. If we multiply this figure by the current number of delinquent, mentally ill, and unemployable children, the cost of neglect to society becomes staggering.

Recommendations
Child Advocate System

Children, who are powerless and need a strong voice to represent them as a minority group, are now without political clout in this country. Therefore, *we recommend that top priority be given to quickly establishing a child advocacy agency financed by the Federal Government and other sources with full ethnic, cultural, racial, and sexual representation.* This agency would be highly autonomous and be charged with fostering, coordinating, and implementing all programs related to the emergence and development of healthy identity among children. The agency would be especially concerned with programs to strengthen family life in all its forms, including: education for parenting, which emphasizes and values the uniqueness of every child; establishing a national commission to strengthen and enhance cultural pluralism, developing community-based comprehensive resource centers for families; and establishing child-oriented environmental commissions at national, state, and local levels.

In view of our past neglect of children, Forum 2 believes that such an agency is necessary before other recommendations can be effectively implemented.

The following guidelines are suggested for implementing this recommendation:

The system shall include a Child Advocate who is a member of the
29 Cabinet of the President of the United States; an interdepart-

mental office directly under the President's office, headed by the Child Advocate which coordinates all Federal agencies in matters related to children; a Child Advocate at the state level in every state who reports directly to the governor; a Child Advocate on every governing body of cities, towns, and villages.

Funding at the national level shall be similar to that of the American Red Cross which receives funds not only from the Federal Government but from other sources, public and private. A high level of autonomy in system operation and utilization of funds must be assured at all levels.

The national Child Advocate's office would be under the control of a national policy board which would establish operating policies and priorities. A similar structure would operate at the state and local levels.

The national policy committee would include representatives from the parent and youth categories, as well as representatives of cultural, ethnic, racial, and sex categories.

The method of selecting the national policy committee must ensure that most members will not be political appointments of the national administration but will *primarily* include members selected in a democratic process so that members represent divergent interests and positions.

Comprehensive Resource Center for Families

We recommend a new organizational form such as a neighborhood resource and service center to coordinate all community programs that can help families meet the needs of their children. Resources and services should be designed to eliminate those conditions that limit the nurture of a healthy sense of identity and the development of positive self-concepts. Such a center would have liaison with the local welfare department and make available public health, recreation, Veterans Administration, and other services such as those provided by churches and private social agencies.

Neighborhood centers would be community controlled and locally autonomous. Services would be easily accessible and available to all on demand, on a 24-hour-a-day basis. The center would provide:

Information and referral to all social services through a nationwide computer input system.

Escort, transportation, and supportive relationships to enable individuals to use specialized services and resources not available within the center.

One staff person as a citizen advocate with various bureaucratic systems.

Training to develop indigenous resource personnel.

Comprehensive resources and services such as medical, dental, nutrition, psychological, public welfare, education, parent education, and training are essential for the feeling of well-being that generates and sustains one's sense of self-direction, dignity, and self-respect. These feelings and attitudes can be encouraged through programs that seriously consider social-emotional development curriculum, talent development activities, the development of family communication skills, and support for

cultural diversity and identity. Deliberate efforts will be made to eliminate stereotypic racial, ethnic, and sexual roles in mass media, toys, and other program facilities.

The center's structure should be determined by the needs of the community served. A competent staff should be recruited and provisions made for career development of the indigenous members interested in this area of work. These personnel would represent all age levels, sexes, ethnic, and racial backgrounds.

Models from which these centers can be developed include:

Parent and child centers

Comprehensive health centers

Comprehensive mental health centers

New careers

Neighborhood information centers

Social services in Head Start

Lincoln Hospital, New York

Institute for Personal Effectiveness in Children, San Diego, California

Tom Gordon's Parent Effectiveness Training

Community Controlled Health Center, Cincinnati, Ohio

Institute for Training in Program Development, Los Angeles, California

67-582 O - 71 - 8

ERIC

Education for Parenting

We recommend that a multifaceted approach be used to convey information on human development and family relations to parents and parents-to-be and to others who interact with infants and young children.

Approaches should provide "how to" information and techniques for day-to-day child rearing, and should provide the parents understanding of how a child's healthy and functional identity emerges. The rights and responsibilities of parenthood must also be conveyed.

Providing, at different levels, courses in child development and family relations should be a primary goal. These educational courses should help individuals appreciate the development processes of children in ways which will aid more creatively both the child in his struggle for identity and those who assume parental roles, either full-time or part-time, in their key responsibility for strengthening a child's sense of identity.

Two key avenues to follow in implementing parenting education are schools and the mass media.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN
REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT
(Selected Excerpts)

Report of Forum 5
The Future of Learning: Into the Twenty-First Century

Early Childhood Learning

Especially needed are well-developed models of early learning. We know now that the first five years of life largely determine the characteristics of the young adult. And yet, we fail these years shamefully either through neglect; or through narrow, thoughtless shaping; or through erratic shifts from too little to too much concern. Although health is the special province of several other Forums of this Conference, we believe that it is impossible to provide the kind of learning environment we envisage in the absence of coherent, well-planned, and integrated health services to children from birth on. We believe also that early childhood centers are appropriate places for mothers-to-be to receive prenatal medical care and education and we urge their widespread establishment. There is ample evidence that commercial interests exploit the undiscriminating drive of many Americans to see to it that their children are well prepared for school. There also is abundant evidence that millions of parents fail to provide their children with the guidance, support, and social and intellectual skills they need for productive independence.

Two successive governments have promised and failed to deliver on a vast effort for expansion and improvement in the education of young children. A National Laboratory in Early Childhood Education suffered a crippled birth under one administration and is now starving to death under another. *We need research on the developmental processes of the young: educational programs based on what we now know; thousands of adequately prepared teachers to staff nursery and play schools; and exemplary models of programs stressing cognitive, aesthetic, motor, and affective development.*

Page 82

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN
REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT
(Selected Excerpts)

Report of Forum 7
The Right to Read

Recommendations
The Right to Read Effort

This Forum's primary recommendation is that high national priority be given to expanding and strengthening the Right to Read effort, both within educational systems and outside them, and to making it a powerful, coordinated instrument of national purpose. **The following are in support of this recommendation.**

The White House Conference should strongly endorse the Right to Read effort as a top educational priority, and the Conference should support the mobilization and coordination of national, state, and local resources to further the effort.

Since the existing administrative and fiscal arrangements within the United States Office of Education are as yet still inadequate to mount and implement a total national Right to Read effort, we urge that:

Enabling legislation be introduced in the United States Congress to establish a national priority for the Right to Read effort

An appropriate level of funding be authorized to support the Right to Read effort

An administrative organization be established to coordinate and direct all programs, existing and contemplated, related to the Right to Read effort

The National Reading Council must continue to use all available means to marshal support for the Right to Read effort in both the public and private sector, and state governments must play their full part in coordinating and financing reading programs.

Five key areas which must receive priority attention in all endeavors to strengthen the Right to Read effort are:

Basic and applied research into the teaching and learning of reading

Teacher education programs, particularly in the teaching of reading

The availability and accessibility of appropriate materials and experiences to meet the child's needs and interests

The importance of preschool and out-of-school activities with parents and others in the community to cognitive and affective development basic to learning to read

Application of modern management principles and methods at all levels in education to assure the best use of resources toward rapid progress.

Parents and Community

Teaching programs must be devised to make the most constructive use of all resources, including parents, volunteers, neighborhoods, and public libraries. The community must make a positive contribution to the learning environment. Educational and cultural centers must be open to everyone all year and around the clock. Specifically, we recommend that:

All school systems should make available programs for parents to improve their effectiveness as auxiliary sources of help to children in reading. These programs should: provide supervised work with young children; help parents and others to understand and use the resources they possess and those of the community; and be researched and evaluated to test the validity of their assumptions and to prove their effectiveness.

Preschool programs should include deep involvement of parents in planning and supporting the teaching process. Parents should have ample preparation for this role through education, observation, and participation.

Professionally staffed day care centers should be provided for youngsters of working parents. These centers should use all known information about stimulating children's total development; they should not be merely custodial in nature. The cost of such programs is small in comparison to the social and personal costs of illiteracy.

Teachers should spend a portion of the school year working in the community; and, conversely, members of the community should participate in the school program. Teachers should become more knowledgeable and understanding about the social and cultural backgrounds of their students and the adjustment necessary to meet the needs of such diversity.

Libraries should be required by state library agencies to initiate community surveys to determine the kinds and quantities of materials and services available and to identify gaps in such materials and services.

Cooperative plans should be formulated for filling the gaps found, including the recruitment and training of volunteers and paraprofessionals, and in-service education for teachers.

Public and school libraries should coordinate planning to optimize the use of facilities and trained personnel and to pull the community and the school even closer together.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should supply leadership and funds for pilot project demonstrations, surveys, and plans in communities of varying sizes and differing population makeup.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN
REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT
(Selected Excerpts)

Report of Forum 8
Confronting Myths of Education

Supplementary Recommendations

The following recommendations were not preferentially ranked by the Forum and are presented below in random order.

We recommend the development and funding of programs for early childhood and parental learning which fully utilize each community's human and physical resources. These programs should be integrated with existing elementary school programs and/or alternative forms of public education.

Pressure should be placed on mass media to develop quality learning programs for all children, as well as for parents and other adults.

To encourage respect for the dignity of *all* work, the government at every level (local, state, and national) should support the development of occupational orientation programs for children.

The whole community must be involved in determining goals for the education of their children, that is, schools must be controlled by the people they are intended to serve. For all segments of the community to participate fully, it may be necessary to provide remuneration to some individuals.

Recognizing the importance of each child's individuality, we believe our society should provide a variety of educational opportunities responsive to differences among children. We recommend that the community's definition of its educational system include sufficiently diverse programs to enable children to understand the world in which they live.

We stress that any school-age child, regardless of race, creed, color, national origin, or socioeconomic background, must be allowed to attend any public school in his school district.

We recommend that the total findings of the White House Conference on Children be brought to the attention of the entire nation.

A documentary on the findings of the Conference should be produced and presented during prime time on nationwide television, and the film should be made available to Conference participants, PTA members, and other interested groups.

Thought-provoking ten-second spot announcements on the Conference findings should follow up the documentary.

Early Childhood

We believe that:

Learning begins in earliest childhood, and further that the child's intellectual and emotional development cannot be separated from his physical development.

The child's caretaker, whether the parents or other adults, has a potentially crucial role in the facilitation of this development.

We therefore propose support at all levels of education of parents and prospective parents in the principles of early childhood education. We further propose that such a program include full medical care, beginning with pregnancy. (H)

136

We endorse the concept of a full program of preschool education to supplement that obtained through the family. (H)

We recommend that a greater emphasis be given to effective preschool programs and facilities for those who wish to utilize them. Such programs should be articulated with the elementary school programs. (E)

We recommend immediate action for the development and funding of programs for early childhood-parent learning experiences involving full utilization of community human and physical resources. (B)

To develop respect for the dignity of *all* work and to provide occupational awareness, we urge the Federal government support the development of meaningful programs of occupational orientation for preschool and elementary children. (E)

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENC E ON CHILDREN
REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT
(Selected Excerpts)

Report of Forum 9
Educational Technology: Constructive or Destructive?

Our concern for the first step in the process of educational technology—the assessment of needs—led us to a conclusion shared by other Forums: that very young children should be provided with learning environments that will maximize opportunities for development. It is consistent with our basic premise that educational technology is a *process* devoted to the goal of *improved individual learning*. A critical element in this process is the consideration of the perceptual, intellectual, physical, and emotional development of each child. Despite nearly universal recognition that the influences of the earliest years from birth are critically important, we have taken only the most tentative steps to ensure that children in these formative years can develop their intellectual, physical, and emotional capacities as they should. The children of the poor are especially handicapped because their early lives are notably deprived of the suitable environmental stimulation that is often found in the homes of the affluent.

The members of this Forum believe, therefore, that free public education should be available to all children at an early age. We do not believe, however, that the existing elementary schools should simply add earlier grades to their existing structures. Early learning must be considered a special and separate area of education; different and more flexible kinds of programs should be created for these younger children according to their developmental needs; considerable attention should be directed to training teachers and especially parents in the education of very young children; and means should be found to help parents provide appropriate early childhood education *in the home*.

We see little hope of improved learning without a substantial infusion of new funds. While much might undoubtedly be done within existing school budgets, it is naive to suggest that a significant effort to design new educational programs for American children can be made without additional funds. Good educational research and development cost money, and in virtually every area of modern life such investments have proven to be unusually worthwhile. It is tragic that the current investment in educational research and development is far smaller than in almost any other area of society.

Pre-School Education

We recommend that free, Federally supported public education in the United States be made available for children at age three. Education should also be provided for parents of children under three in order to constitute a total program.

Specifically, we recommend:

That education for the child under six not be limited to formal classrooms; that education take place in preschools, parent centers, pre-parent classes, child care centers, prenatal clinics, home visitation programs, and nursery schools, but not limited to these

That parent involvement become an integral part of each program funded by any governmental agency

That courses in child growth and development become an integral part of the secondary school curriculum, as well as part of teacher training programs

That standards defined in *Federal Interagency Standards for Daytime Programs* be considered the minimum standards

That the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare be instructed to prepare by December 31, 1971 a comprehensive plan for implementing the above, with the assistance of a representative citizens' advisory committee in which minority groups are properly represented. This plan should be distributed to all delegates to the 1970 White House Conference on Children and to appropriate state and local agencies not later than July 1, 1972.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN
REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT
(Selected Excerpts)

Report of Forum 10
Keeping Children Healthy: Health Protection and Disease Prevention.

Introduction

The United States has long offered Americans the opportunity to confront and master new frontiers. But, although we have accomplished much in some areas, constructive health services and disease prevention still offer unlimited challenges. Such services, which reduce the prevalence of illness and enhance the quality of life, are especially effective in infants and children. They must now be implemented on an universal basis in this country.

This Forum considers preventive health care to include not only good physical and dental care but also adequate housing, quality education, sufficient clothing, good nutrition, good sanitation, as well as opportunities to experience love, achieve self-respect, participate in play, and become meaningfully involved with others.

Several population groups in this country, currently subject to unusual health hazards, offer special opportunities for constructive health care. Children from low income families, for example, experience more preventable deaths and permanently handicapping conditions than any other group. Indeed, poverty is the most important cause of poor health in children and youth in this country, especially among young infants, handicapped and emotionally disturbed children, and children of migrant workers. Another highly vulnerable group includes expectant mothers.

Social pathology is also a major cause of death and disability among our young children. Narcotic addiction, prejudice, understimulation, violence, and indifference to human needs are major problems which threaten our very society.

If we accept the principle that health is the right rather than the privilege of every person, we must give the development of the needed services a high priority. This report examines the current scene—the problems, accomplishments, and goals—and suggests programs for both immediate and long-term action.

Special Problems of Vulnerable Groups

Poverty is the most important cause of poor health in children and youth in this country. Twenty percent of the population lives in poverty, and millions of low income families are needlessly subjected to ill health and destined to unfulfilled development. These children receive less health care than those in better economic circumstances and experience more preventable deaths and permanently handicapping conditions. Such a child is two or three times more likely to be born with a low birth weight than a white middle-class child, and he is twice as likely to die before his first birthday. Approximately one out of three Indian babies in the United States dies between the ages of one month and one year, largely from preventable diseases, and those that survive only have a life expectancy of 43 years.

In remote rural areas, such as Appalachia, there are critical shortages of health personnel, preventive health services, school lunch programs, and public transportation. Maternal and infant mortality rates are at least one-third higher than the national mean.

Poverty is associated with poor and crowded housing, unemployment, limited education, malnutrition, bad sanitation, and a sense of being left out; it is also allied with an increase in prematurity, infant mortality, tuberculosis, venereal disease, hepatitis, nutritional anemia, and rat bites. It is tragic that in our

affluent and technically-advanced country, Indian children suffer from typhoid, dysentery, tuberculosis, hepatitis, diphtheria, and trachoma.

While the White House Conference on Children must address itself to all children in the country, several population groups are subject to unusual health hazards and offer special opportunities for constructive health services.

Expectant Mothers

Prenatal, delivery, and postpartum services are not available to approximately 600,000 women in the very low economic groups. In large cities, between one-fourth and one-half of women in low income families deliver with little or no prenatal care, and in some inner city and rural areas, the proportion is even higher. These women face excessive complications affecting not only their own health but their infants' as well.

Partly because of inadequate maternal and infant care, including family planning services, the rates for infant mortality and prematurity are twice as high among the poor as among the middle class. The low-birth-weight babies, who are much more likely to experience permanent neurologic disorders such as cerebral palsy or mental retardation, are born to the poor in disproportionately large numbers. Inadequate maternal care also leads to high rates of illness among infants and children born to such mothers.

The nature of the maternal complications, the brief period available to the obstetrician to modify their unfavorable influence on the outcome of pregnancy, and the resulting large proportion of low-birth-weight infants underlines the necessity to provide interconceptional care so that the next pregnancy may have a more favorable outcome. Such preventive services would include management of maternal anemia, diabetes, chronic nephritis, malnutrition, pyelonephritis, and toxemia; early detection of maternal-infant blood group incompatabilities and maternal syphilis; and provision of educational, nutritional and mental health services.

Prevention of prematurity is an urgent goal. More than any other factor, a decrease in premature births would markedly lower infant mortality and the neurologic sequences of prematurity. The prevention of prematurity involves not only purely medical considerations but, even more importantly, attention to social and economic causes. The rate of prematurity, for example, is two times greater in out-of-wedlock pregnancies.

Family planning may be helpful in the optimal spacing of children for biological as well as psychological and social growth and development. While there is a proven relationship between the length of the interval between pregnancies and neonatal mortality, the significance for child rearing practices of children born in quick succession is not yet well understood.

Infants

In infant mortality, the United States ranks thirteenth internationally. This unacceptable situation reflects many problems besides the health of the baby, chiefly inadequacies in human services. While it is encouraging that infant mortality is decreasing in this country, the birth of low-birth-weight infants is not.

156

With approximately 60 percent of infant deaths occurring within the first two days, 15 percent in the remaining 25 days, and 25

percent during the rest of the first year, more adequate health care services are urgently needed during the first year of life, especially in the perinatal and neonatal periods.

The ability of many mothers to provide adequate maternal care is seriously hampered either by past life experiences or by contemporary stresses. Mothers at high-risk for social and psychologic reasons may have infants who do not thrive physically, socially, emotionally, or cognitively. Pathogenic life experiences may include the history of a poor relationship with her own mother, a previous or on-going emotional illness, unresolved grief, marital discord, medical illness, several children in quick succession, an out-of-wedlock pregnancy, illness in the family or multiple moves during the pregnancy. Contemporary events that may undermine the mother's ability to provide adequately for her baby include the birth of a premature infant, the presence of a congenital defect in the infant, an early critical illness in the infant, maternal depression, a difficult delivery, psychological or physical absence of the husband, social isolation, financial insecurity, or multiple births. Needless separation of an infant or young child from his mother (for hospitalization or other reasons) may also produce a special risk factor for the child.

Still another important problem area is that although immunizing agents are available against certain infectious diseases a significant percentage of the nation's children are not adequately immunized.

Children and Youth

About 12 million children need special care for eye conditions, over 3 million for speech impediments, and over 2 million for orthopedic handicaps. These and other health needs are not being met because of inadequate preventive, diagnostic, and treatment services in low income areas, particularly in major cities.

Children from these areas often enter school without previous medical or dental care. At this time in many large outpatient departments, children are waiting five to seven hours to be seen hurriedly by a physician. When health problems are discovered through school examinations and screening programs, community agencies often lack the resources to provide treatment and follow-up care. Opportunities for the children to be enrolled in systems of continuing health supervision are markedly absent.

Oral diseases are the most prevalent chronic diseases in the United States today, affecting everyone during his lifetime. Their onset may begin early in childhood, and, subsequent neglect may explain the conspicuous deterioration of oral health found in the adult population. However, only about 15 percent of the country's nearly 1600 local health units have dental health programs staffed by dentists or dental hygienists.

The special needs of low income children are illustrated by the finding that 75 percent of children in families with an annual income of less than $2,000 and 66 percent in the families earning less than $4,000 have never seen a dentist.

It is paradoxical that this problem should be permitted to continue when the requirements for prevention and amelioration have been determined, and a positive, clearcut course of action is available.

Comprehensive Child Health Care Program

As a first step, toward a more formalized national health program, this Forum recommends that a Federally financed comprehensive child health care program be established with a stable, permanent Federal financing mechanism. The program should adopt reimbursement procedures, including prepayment, designed to create incentives for more rational, organized, and efficient systems of health care delivery which stress illness prevention and health promotion. Such services should also have periodic peer and consumer review for quality and appropriateness.

In the present health crisis, however, everything that needs to be done cannot realistically be accomplished overnight. While aspiring to provide comprehensive health services for all, special attention must now be given to those with the greatest needs. This Forum believes that the national health care program and all Federal programs providing health care services to children should allocate a specific percentage of their budgets to help finance new resources in critical areas. Children from low income families, handicapped children, children in remote areas, and expectant mothers should not be asked to wait for a national health program. They deserve access to decent care now. Pending the development of a universal comprehensive health care program, presently existing programs for high risk population groups should be extended and strengthened and the knowledge derived from these programs utilized in developing a comprehensive national health care program for children.

Although programs for children and families may have multiple funding sources, some mechanism should be defined to combine these financial supports, eliminating the fragmentation caused by categorical health programs and the separation of wellness and illness care. In education, for example, several well-conceived, Federally-sponsored educational programs, with significant health inputs, span the totality of infancy through childhood. The programs are: Parent and Child Care Centers (0 to 3 years); Head Start (3 to 6 years); Follow Through (kindergarten to third

164

grade); Title I Program (elementary to junior high school particularly); and rapidly proliferating day care programs under a variety of auspices. If all these programs existed in the same community, as they logically should, the child could move in an uninterrupted sequence through each program to derive maximum benefits.

The fact is that each program is individually administered, located, and evaluated with little regard to the local situation. Similar fragmentation and lack of communication at the national level are also reflected at the regional, state, and local levels. Although all programs have well-developed health components, their basic objectives and methodology of achieving these objectives are not the same. To complicate the health picture further, multiple health programs are also concerned with this same population. Integration of such programs as maternal and infant care projects, children and youth programs, and neighborhood health centers must be pursued further.

Target Populations with Problems of High Priority

In recent years the national maternal and child health programs have endeavored to reduce infant mortality especially among the economically disadvantaged, and to increase accessibility of health services for those in low income areas and other areas lacking adequate services. *The following high risk groups should receive special emphasis in a comprehensive health care program:*

Comprehensive Maternity and Infant Care

This Forum recommends that funds be used from both existing Title V programs and new legislation for a broadened attack on these problems of high infant mortality rates and poor health of mothers in deprived areas.

If 20 percent of the total population are in the low income group, about 750,000 children are born annually to women in poverty. The maternity and infant care projects, now numbering 58, provide comprehensive maternity care annually for 125,000 women and their infants in this economic group. These projects, now in their fifth year, are providing high quality care, are well-received and are effectively reducing infant mortality among this income group. These programs should be expanded to make such services available to all pregnant women from low income groups.

In addition, family planning services should be extended to the approximately five million women of child-bearing age who live in low income areas throughout the country and who would use family planning services if they were available.

Preschool and School Age Children

A major emphasis in funding health services programs should be placed on comprehensive care for preschool and school age children in low-income areas, particularly. In the next five years, it should be possible to support projects serving areas in which a total of 3.5 million children live.

A special program is needed to permit a broad public health attack on the widespread problem of poor dental health. *This Forum endorses the American Dental Association's proposal for a national dental program for children and the implementation of community dental programs for children. It is also recommended that a system of remedial mobile dental units be initiated in areas without permanent dental installations.*

Preventive programs including fluoridation of public water supplies and substitutes for sucrose in the diet should be expanded. Where the population is only partially served by municipal or sanitary district water supplies, as in largely rural states, school fluoridators or supervised self-applied topical fluoride applications can be used.

Constructive Health Services Based on Developmental Needs of Children

Since this nation cannot meet the health needs of the entire population in the next several years and since priorities must be set, this Forum asks that a high priority for immediately available health services be assigned to children and youth. Children have special vulnerabilities because they are developing and growing rapidly. What happens to their early development determines to a large extent their social, vocational, physical, and emotional competence as adults. Children also represent the best investment for preventive health services, the most economical type of care in terms of effectiveness.

This section discusses preventive health services for the developmental needs of children at different stages of their life process. Establishing a relationship between the provider and the consumer of health services is equally important in achievement of long-term health as it is in long-term illness. Truly constructive health services require a continuity and a growing relationship that permits the consumer to utilize comfortably and fully his opportunities for health.

171

Preventive health services based on the child's developmental level apply to both normal and handicapped children. Too often there has been reluctance to perceive what is common between handicapped and normal children, and separate services have been developed for categorical illnesses with emphasis chiefly on a specific defect rather than on total child development or family adjustment. Since this often happens even though the multidisciplinary team aspires to comprehensive care, it may be necessary to complement the traditional multidisciplinary categorical disease clinics with settings in which children are seen according to their developmental stage rather than their disease state. Such an approach would promote management attuned to the development of the child, and include attention to the family as well as the child, without reducing the effectiveness of special services for categorical illnesses.

Because of the special hazards to health and the changing opportunities for health enhancement at various stages of human development, this Forum believes that organization of preventive health services can profitably be approached on the basis of developmental stages.

Prenatal

The goals for adequate prenatal services have been stressed above. Fuller use should be made of educational opportunities to help mothers and fathers during the prenatal and perinatal periods, especially new parents. Mothers who are at high risk because of either organic or psychologic reasons should receive special attention; they and their babies represent a specially vulnerable group.

More adequate support services are needed for mothers during the prenatal period, with special attention to maternity benefits. Most advanced countries, except the United States, give special recognition to pregnant women and provide appropriate adjustments in their working life. Such benefits could include a maternity leave of absence, time off to visit their physician for prenatal examinations, and other considerations necessary to protect the health of the mother and developing infant.

1125

Perinatal

National standards should be developed for perinatal care including standards for newborn intensive care units. Hospitals unable to meet such standards should be required to close their obstetrical and neonatal services. They should be provided incentives to remodel this space for other uses.

Regional perinatal centers should be established, equipped and supported by Federal funds, and means should be developed to transport babies with special needs from outlying hospitals to these regional centers.

Because the birth of a premature infant, and the subsequent physical separation of the mother from that infant, may interfere with the development of a close relationship between mother and infant, consideration should be given to changing current policies which restrict the mother's access to the infant.

The lying-in period provides an opportunity to identify problems, for example, whether adequate arrangements have been made for the mother's and infant's return home, to discuss infant care, and to provide information about family planning. The mother who wishes to breast feed her baby should be given assistance and encouragement. Health services for mothers or infants, particularly supportive services, should be augmented during the early weeks after birth with home visits by professional staff or health aides.

172

Greater attention should be given to education of women in mothercraft. Communities should have well-organized arrangements for answering parents' questions.

Infancy

"Failure to thrive" is a syndrome involving many thousands of infants in this country. In most instances, it is due to a mothering disability, and constitutes one more reason why the serving professions need to bolster and fortify mothers with early intervention and the best possible preventive services. Understimulation or inappropriate stimulation also present developmental threats to thousands of infants, and warrant attention in well child care.

Many children are inadequately immunized or have had no immunization whatsoever. A national effort should be made to immunize every child in this nation.

This Forum supports the establishment of day care centers for infants and preschool children throughout the nation. Such centers have the potential for fostering physical, social, cognitive, and emotional development. They should provide a setting which is physically safe and sanitary, good nutrition, warm caretakers to mother the children, activities which are stimulating and enjoyable, opportunities for play and for the use of the young child's sensory and motor functions, and a chance to be happy. A guide to standards for day care of children under three years of age has been prepared by the American Academy of Pediatrics Committee on Infant and Preschool Child.

Day care centers are not, however, a panacea. They cannot compensate for inadequate mothering or substitute for continuing stimulation within the home. Programs, in which child development aides visit the child's home, work with the mother, and help her provide a more growth-promoting environment for the infant, need further explorations.

In addition to day care centers, the community should have drop-in child care centers where infants or young children can be left safely when mothers have sudden emergencies or medical or other appointments.

Early Childhood

This Forum warmly endorses the Head Start program and recommends that it be extended to all children in this nation on a year-round basis.

The Forum is also greatly concerned about the prevention of accidents to children and urges operational research for the prevention of such accidents.

This Forum believes that hospitalization of children should be prevented whenever possible through the development of additional ambulatory care facilities, day care, and home care programs, parent-care-motel-like units in children's hospitals, and arrangements for mothers to live in with the child patients. Increased preparation of children for hospitalization or surgery needs emphasis. Greater attention should be given to the needs of children as children in hospitals, and the development of hospital child-life workers to fulfill such needs should be further explored.

173

Page 173

Day care nursery schools need to be further developed for young handicapped children as well as for non-handicapped children. Frequently, the handicapped child can be included in nursery schools for non-handicapped children.

School

Educational opportunities, inadequate in many areas for children with normal intellectual development, are often tragically underdeveloped for children with specific learning disabilities, mental retardation, emotional disturbance, or other handicapping conditions. Educational opportunities for the nation's gifted children are also underdeveloped. All personnel serving children are important as "models." Teachers, health workers, and all adults can be important figures with whom the children can identify, thus promoting the children's motivation to learn, and creating or reinforcing their expectations of personal success.

School health programs should contribute to the development of life-long patterns of physical activity and fitness. Health instruction, including family life education, sex education, and mental health, should help the child learn more about himself and his family and should instill in the child a sense of responsibility for his own health.

In some cases, the school may have to function as a parent-surrogate for health services for children of school age.

Teachers should have easy access to early consultation with psychologists, social workers, pediatricians, and child psychiatrists for some of the developmental problems confronting them in the classroom.

Adolescence

This Forum recommends that a variety of new opportunities be created for adolescents to work with young children. Young people today are much more aware of, concerned about, and responsive to their fellow men; a greater number of them want to serve others.

A national program to prevent school drop-outs among adolescents should be established. This would include providing adequate clothing for school and using existing knowledge to prevent unwanted pregnancies in unwed adolescent girls.

Health education programs should help prevent the use of cigarettes, alcohol, and drugs. Adequate driver education and promotion of highway safety are other important components of a broad educational approach to the adolescent.

Page 174

87-582 O - 71 - 9

Adulthood	Information relevant to the prevention of disease in adult life should be implemented.
Education of Child Care Workers	*This Forum endorses efforts to broaden the knowledge of all child care personnel concerning child growth and development and to increase their sensitivity to children's needs.* Not only will these skills improve their services to children but they will also promote early detection of aberrations in normal development and permit early assessment and intervention.
Protective Services vs. Child Abuse	*This Forum recommends that the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws draft a uniform child abuse act.* State-wide central registries should be maintained of information reported on child abuse, for example, age and sex of the child, type of abuse, identity of child abuser, relationship to child if any, and other characteristics.
174	

Page 174

Child Advocacy	*This Forum recommends the development of a child advocacy system at national, state, community, and neighborhood levels to delineate the needs of children and families, to promote solutions, to authorize studies, to hold hearings, and to promote the goal of healthy children and healthy families.* This Forum believes that children's needs must be made highly visible; otherwise, as experience has shown, children and youth do not receive appropriate attention or support. Children need a lobby. This Forum also recognizes that an advocacy system must be coupled with a detailed, realistic program for child health with a variety of options and an indication of priorities. Advocacy without a plan or a real chance to do something about identified needs and problems leads only to frustration.
175	

Page 175

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN
REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT
(Selected Excerpts)

Report of Forum 11
Making Children Healthy: Delivery of Health Care Services

Preamble

Prior White House Conferences on Children, attempting to fulfill charges similar to the one we have accepted, devoted themselves primarily to information gathering. As a result, we now know a great deal more about health maintenance, prevention of illness and disability, and treatment of disease in childhood than we did when the first White House Conference was called. We know more about the normal developmental phases of childhood and youth, physically, intellectually, and emotionally. We are infinitely more aware of the relationship between a child's health and his total environment—family income, parental education, quality of nutrition, housing, and stability of family relationships.

During this Conference, however, we have become aware of the significant gap between what we know and what we have done. We have reviewed the appalling deficits of our current health system with all its implications for the future well-being and even survival of many of the nation's children.

The extraordinary evidence of need has brought us to the conclusion that a Federally financed comprehensive child health care program must be established promptly and implemented aggressively as a first step in the development of a national health program for the entire population.

The Need

Fifty-five million children in this country are under fourteen years of age and four million new births are predicted for each year of the 1970's. In this decade, then, we can expect 100 million children, at different stages of their development, will need health services.

These children are the nation's most treasured resources. We cannot afford to let them enter a health care system as woefully inadequate as the present one. Safeguarding the health of all the nation's children is not only humane, prudent, and compassionate; it is mandatory for the nation's best interests.

Our total health services system has been under critical scrutiny in recent years. Study after study has reiterated that services are too often fragmented, discontinuous, far from ideal in terms of availability and accessibility, hobbled by health manpower problems, and frequently delivered with little concern for the consumers' preferences, his understanding, his convenience, or even his personal dignity. This cumulative recitation of deficits has provoked widespread response—from the consumer, from health professionals, and from government leadership. Some improvements have been made and other more far-reaching changes are on the way.

The shortcomings of our current health care system have grave implications for the entire population. For children, whose future well-being and even survival are at stake, the implications are catastrophic.

Infant Mortality

This country's infant mortality rate (21.8 per 1,000 live births in 1968) is *higher* than that of twelve other developed nations in the world. Variations within the country are even more significant, ranging from 16.9 in North Dakota to 35.5 in Mississippi. That rate is almost twice as high for non-whites (many of whom live in environmental deprivation) as for whites. Within a single large city, infant mortality varies from 27 per 1,000 among the lowest socioeconomic groups to 16 per 1,000 among the higher groups. Factors contributing to infant mortality include: pregnancies

183

among girls under seventeen, short interval conceptions, absence of prenatal care, prematurity, lack of adequate diet during pregnancy and throughout life up until pregnancy, smoking during pregnancy, excessive restriction of weight gain during pregnancy, especially among underweight women and pregnant adolescents. These factors are all, to some degree, preventable.

Immunization

We are far short of our goal of immunizing children against diseases for which protection has been developed. Almost half the under-nineteen population has not been adequately immunized against diphtheria-pertussis-tetanus. Fewer than 75 percent of persons in the same age group have been immunized against rubeola. The percentage of children ages one through four who are fully immunized against poliomyelitis has fallen from a high of 87.6 percent in 1964 to 67.7 percent in 1969.

Dental Care

Half the children in the country under age fifteen and 90 percent of those under age five have never been to a dentist, although virtually all children need dental care.

Mental Health

Evidence shows that less than half the children needing mental health services are receiving them.

Malnutrition

Malnutrition threatens many children from the moment of conception, and if that malnutrition persists during the first five years of life, the child is doomed to foreshortened physical and mental development, increased susceptibility to infection, and impaired response to his environment.

Pre- and Perinatal Care

Approximately one million children are born each year to mothers who lack medical care during pregnancy and receive inadequate obstetrical services during delivery; these children are particularly vulnerable to problems in the perinatal period.

Handicapping Conditions

An estimated ten to twenty percent of all children in this country suffer from chronic handicapping conditions. There is reason to believe that at least one-third of these conditions could be prevented or corrected by appropriate care in the preschool years, and continuing comprehensive care up to age eighteen would prevent or correct as many as sixty percent of these conditions.

Many of these appalling deficits have long existed, and have been cited again and again. We do not believe that this reiteration need necessarily generate despair; we have made significant progress in several areas. But our population growth and our rising level of expectations with respect to health care have outrun our accomplishments. *Now* is the time for action.

Health Care Programs Currently Available to Children and Youth

Many excellent health care programs are now available, offering *some* services to *some* children. Federal programs which have enormous potential for children include State Maternal and Child Health and Crippled Children's Services, Medicaid, the Maternity and Infant Care and Children and Youth projects, Neighborhood Health Center programs and health services developed in support of Head Start programs.

These public programs are divided among a number of governmental jurisdictions, and compete for both funds and manpower. To a significant degree, they suffer from dismemberment of agencies within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which are concerned with child health services. The Children's Bureau, a significant accomplishment of the first White

184

House Conference, has been divested of its power and no longer speaks authoritatively and effectively on behalf of child health. Furthermore, child health programs are divided in such a manner in the Federal establishment that little liaison occurs between research activities and service programs, and no coordinated working relationship exists among the service components.

Despite the disadvantages under which the Federal child health establishment currently operates, several existing programs have yielded constructive experiences in the delivery of services which could be applied to a wider base. In addition, some state and local voluntary health agencies serve children and their families, although admittedly in ways that far from match the needs.

But none of the existing programs delivers all of what is needed to all children who need it. Some of the gaps are immediately apparent. For example, there is now no systematic way of keeping track of the health needs of a child from the time he leaves the hospital a few days after birth until he enters the school system. Many children arrive at school without having ever received medical and dental supervision, and often with unrecognized, correctable defects. These are casualties of our hit-and-miss system. A second group of candidates for sustained neglect are children of the "near poor"—families who do not qualify for many of the publicly funded programs and yet whose own financial resources can buy care only for crisis situations. And even families whose budgets can accommodate continuing health care for their children are plagued by fragmentation of that care, unpredictable availability of health manpower, and the prospect of insupportable catastrophic illness.

Our need, then, is to provide *all* health services to *all* children, and to make sure that *each child uses* what is available and needed.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN
REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT
(Selected Excerpts)

Report of Forum 12
Children Who Are Handicapped

Current Trends and Problems
Advances in Knowledge

Encouraging gains have been made in our knowledge about, and ability to prevent or treat, all types of handicapping conditions —physical, mental, social, and developmental disabilities.

Newer medicines can now control most epileptic seizures. Recent research has made it possible to prevent erythroblastosis, a disorder arising from Rh factor incompatibility which formerly killed 5,000 infants a year, and left many survivors with developmental disabilities. Advances in prenatal and obstetrical care can, if used, prevent mental retardation caused by malnutrition during pregnancy, by birth injuries, and by infections in the mother. Vaccinating today's children against German measles (rubella) will prevent thousands of serious birth defects in the future. And, if conditions such as phenylketonuria and other inborn metabolism errors are recognized early, special diets can prevent or reduce resulting retardation.

Dramatic advances have also been made in rehabilitation. The child without a leg, an arm, hearing, or sight, or with other disabilities can now be helped to a normal or near normal life using present knowledge and techniques to train his body and mind. Current experiments in organ transplants are opening a whole new field of future rehabilitation techniques.

Research has also made considerable strides in the area of genetic handicaps. A child's chances of inheriting a handicapping condition or a predisposition to it can now frequently be determined; in some instances, defects can actually be diagnosed in a fetus, and some may be correctable in the future.

In addition, research indicates that many forms of mental retardation are not biological problems, but arise from adverse environmental and cultural situations. For instance, many children unable to compete in school or in society lacked the early childhood developmental experiences necessary to prevent functional retardation. This prevalent type of mental retardation, which affects about eighty percent of all retarded, can be prevented by reaching the child early enough with the growth and learning experiences essential to mental development.

197

Environmental and cultural factors can also produce physical and social disabilities. The destructive outlook manifested by many juvenile delinquents, for example, can be caused by environmental disadvantages and faulty parental behavior at any socioeconomic level. Inadequate nutrition, poor education, or overcrowded housing can hinder a child's physical and mental development, preventing achievement of his full potential. Racism, too, creates an atmosphere antagonistic to sound mental and emotional growth. And environmental pollution can poison the body and brain and even inflict genetic damage. The discovery and understanding of how these factors affect growth and development can be viewed as a first step toward preventing environmentally produced handicaps.

Methods for treating mental illness in children, whatever the cause, have also continued to improve. These methods can also prevent or lessen emotional difficulties in the physically disabled or mentally retarded child. Without help, these emotional problems may produce chronic handicapping. As part of treatment of emotional problems, members of many disciplines, including trained nonprofessionals, social workers, and family counselors, can frequently help restore a child to health by improving a family situation unfavorable to his emotional development.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN
REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT
(Selected Excerpts)

Report of Forum 12
Children Who Are Handicapped

Legislative Programs for Handicapped Children through Age Three

We recommend legislation that will make the development of high quality programs mandatory for handicapped children through age three.

Every child must have the early life experiences necessary for healthy emotional and intellectual development; programs are needed to help the handicapped child develop the capacities to function adequately on a social and personal level. Included will be experiences that will eliminate, or compensate for, conditions leading to poor self-image, racism, prejudice, and functional mental retardation. Parent-child centers and day care centers are two facilities through which quality child development programs for the preschool handicapped child can be provided. We believe that such programs should be universally available to all children and their families within each community.

To prevent mental and emotional disabilities, we recommend developing universal preschool education and child care programs as well as finding ways to help parents to use them. Such programs are not only especially valuable to children from poverty areas who are most vulnerable to handicapping conditions, but they are essential when mothers must, or wish to, work.

Although preschool and child development programs may appeal to young people particularly, some may find that they can better fill their own and their children's needs through other types of programs. In an increasingly complex world, our approaches to problems of child care must be more flexible.

Similarly, we recognize that the values of the family remain basic, that a stable and happy family can best provide positive early life experiences for the child. Since caring for a child with one or more handicapping conditions can become an intolerable burden to the family, helping the family to cope is another way of providing the young child with quality care. The needs of the child and the family are inseparable, and the public must be responsible for meeting the needs of both.

Family needs can be met through supportive services which include parent education and counseling, and recreational and vocational programs for the child. Services should also help the family solve transportation and home-keeping problems and make quality day care facilities and other community services accessible to the handicapped as well as the "normal" child. Such programs will not only further the development of the child, but also provide relief for the families of handicapped children needing long-term as well as short-term care.

Since health information, family planning, and diagnostic services can play an important role either in preventing or alleviating handicapping conditions, they can be viewed as part of the system of quality care for the young handicapped child. Parents and

parents-to-be should be the primary target for all efforts to impart information on health-preserving practices and on those attitudes and experiences within the family which are most likely to promote normal intellectual and emotional development.

All family and child health services must also include information and assistance in family planning and genetic counseling. Unwanted children often have a greater-than-average chance of having defects at birth or handicapping conditions later on. We believe that no woman should have to bear an unwanted child. If abortions are required to prevent such births, they should be readily available.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Maternity and Infant Care projects represent a promising start toward greater availability of preventive services during a child's first three years. They provide diagnostic, preventive, and treatment services, and child care information to ensure the mother and child's good health throughout pregnancy and the infant's early life. These services can prevent many conditions that may lead to physical or mental defects and can detect others early enough for effective treatment. The current Child and Youth projects extend similar services through the formative years. We therefore recommend that both these programs, or their equivalents, be made available in every community to all families, not just the poor, and that they be integrated with appropriate medical facilities as well as related to the larger community's total health care system. Parent-child centers, a new program of the Office of Child Development (HEW), offer a concept of educational opportunity for children under the age of three.

To aid identification of handicapping conditions, we recommend periodic screening with particular attention to infants identified as high risk for developing disabilities. Children should be screened periodically during their first three years, as well as prior to entering kindergarten and if they experience any difficulty later in school. However, it is essential to examine children for their strengths, not just their weaknesses. It is particularly important to emphasize the handicapped child's abilities rather than his disabilities. Most handicaps are not completely correctable and these children should be encouraged to concentrate on their areas of greatest potential.

In addition, a health record, beginning at birth and including such information as birth weight and length, head circumference, blood types, and examination results, should be compiled for each child. It should be the property of his family. Such a record will help in the prevention, identification, and treatment of any handicapping condition the child may develop.

The mandatory provision of all such programs early in a child's life will be extremely beneficial to the handicapped child. All these services should be part of the comprehensive health care and other systems proposed in our first recommendation. A system must not only screen and evaluate but also provide treatment and, if possible, help correct handicapping conditions. When families cannot or do not take action, the community's child support system must provide whatever help is necessary. This type of action is spelled out in the recommendations for advocacy.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN
REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT
(Selected Excerpts)

Report of Forum 12
Children Who Are Handicapped

Support of the Concept of Child Advocacy

Conference delegates and Forum 12 members generally support the concept of a child advocacy system. We feel such a system has considerable merit and could be applied advantageously to help develop, expand, and ensure coordinated services for the handicapped child.

In health and related systems using the child advocacy concept, representatives at every level of government would not only serve as advisors and champions for all children's needs, but initiate programs to ensure that handicapped children receive needed services and have the opportunity to develop to their fullest potential. A true advocacy system would:

Mandate close working relationships among all agencies providing services, thereby reducing the fragmentation of existing services

Mandate arrangements that would assure that each child's needs are known and met

Help ensure the implementation of enacted legislation

Act as a catalyst to improve, expand, or develop health services for children

Enable families to make better use of services which do exist

Encourage consumer participation in the development and delivery of services.

The concept of an advocacy system could also incorporate a national council on childhood disabilities. Membership would include adults and youth from public, private, and voluntary agencies concerned with the handicapped child. The council could play an important role in implementing our first major recommendation by constantly working to improve programs for the handicapped, setting standards for services, and coordinating the activities of all groups fostering the welfare of handicapped children. At the state and local levels, councils on childhood disabilities might be established to draw together and expand existing resources, develop new ones, and serve the community's children as a friend at court in all health matters.

It was also recommended that a system based on the advocacy concept be funded on a pilot basis to test various models. If a state government chooses not to participate in a Federal advocacy system, the Federal government should have the right to make other arrangements to test a system.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN
REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT
(Selected Excerpts)

Report of Forum 15
Children and Parents: Together in the World

Preamble

If America's parents are given the place, power, and prestige to enable them to function as guides, companions, and sources of love and discipline for their children, and to have a decisive role in determining the environments and programs in which their children live and grow, the great majority of them will be able to take full advantage of the opportunity to enhance the quality of life both for their children and themselves. Only one caution must be borne in mind. The crucial factor is not how much time is spent with the child but how the time is spent. A child learns, he becomes human, primarily through participation in a challenging activity with those he loves and admires. It is the example, challenge, and reinforcement provided by people who care that enable a child to develop both his ability and his identity. An everyday example of the operation of this principle is the mother who daily talks with her young child and—usually without thinking much about it—responds more warmly when he uses new words and expressions and gradually introduces new and more complex forms which the child in turn adopts. It is in work and play with children, in games, in projects, in shared responsibilities with parents, adults, and older children that the child develops the skills, motives, and qualities of character that enable him to live a life that is gratifying both to himself and those around him. But this can only happen in a society that lets and makes it happen, one in which the needs of families and children become a primary concern not merely of special organizations and interest groups but of all major social institutions—government, industry, business, mass media, communities, neighborhoods, and individual citizens. It is the priorities they set that will determine our children's present and America's future.

The Problem

In today's world, parents too often find themselves at the mercy of a society which imposes pressures and priorities that allow neither time nor place for meaningful activities involving children and adults, which downgrade the role of parent and the functions of parenthood, and which prevent the parent from doing the things he wants to do as a guide, friend, and companion to his children.

Our National Priorities

We like to think of America as a child-centered society, but our actions belie our words. A hard look at our institutions and way of life reveals that our national priorities lie elsewhere. The pursuit of affluence, the worship of material things, the hard sell and the soft, the willingness to accept technology as a substitute for human relationships, the imposition of responsibility without support, and the readiness to blame the victims of evil for the evil itself have brought us to the point where a broken television set or a broken computer can provoke more indignation and more action than a broken family or a broken child.

Our national rhetoric not withstanding, the actual patterns of life in America today are such that *children and families all too often come last*. Our society expects its citizens first of all to meet the demands of their jobs and then to fulfill civic and social obligations. Responsibilities to children are to be met, of course, but this is something one is expected to do in one's spare time. But when, where, and how?

The frustrations are greatest for the family of poverty where the capacity for human response is crippled by hunger, cold, filth, sickness, and despair. No parent who spends his days in search of menial work, and his nights in keeping rats away from the crib

can be expected to find the time—let alone the heart—to engage in constructive activities with his children or serve as a stable source of love and discipline.

For families who can get along, the rats are gone but the rat race remains. The demands of a job or often two jobs, claiming mealtimes, evenings, and weekends as well as days; the trips and moves one must make to get ahead or simply hold one's own; the ever increasing time spent in commuting; the parties; evenings out; and social and community obligations—all the things one has to do if one is to meet one's primary responsibility—produce a situation in which a child often spends more time with a passive babysitter than a participating parent.

Children Need People

And here we confront a fundamental and disturbing fact: *children need people in order to become human.* The fact is fundamental because it is firmly grounded both in scientific research and in human experience. It is disturbing because the isolation of children from adults simultaneously threatens the growth of the individual and the survival of the society. The young cannot pull themselves up by their own bootstraps. It is primarily through observing, playing, and working with others older and younger than himself that a child discovers both what he can do and who he can become, that he develops both his ability and his identity. And it is primarily through exposure and interaction with adults and children of different ages that a child acquires new interests and skills, and learns the meaning of tolerance, cooperation, and compassion. To relegate children to a world of their own is to deprive them of their humanity, and ourselves as well.

Yet, this is what is happening in America today. *We are experiencing a breakdown in the process of making human beings human.* By isolating our children from the rest of society, we abandon them to a world devoid of adults and ruled by the destructive impulses and compelling pressures both of the age-segregated peer group and the aggressive and exploitive television screen. By setting our priorities elsewhere, by claiming one set of values while pursuing another, we leave our children bereft of standards and support, and our own lives impoverished and corrupted.

A Disillusioned and Alienated Youth

This reversal of priorities, which amounts to a betrayal of our children, underlies the growing disillusionment and alienation among young people in all segments of American society. Those who grew up in settings where children and families still counted are able to react to their frustration in positive ways—through constructive protest, participation, and public service. Those who come from circumstances in which the family could not function, be it in slum or suburb, can only strike out against an environment they have experienced as indifferent, callous, cruel, and unresponsive. We do not condone the destruction and violence manifested by young people in widely disparate sections of our society; we merely point to the roots of a process which, if not reversed, will continue to spread. *The failure to reorder our priorities, the insistence on business as usual, and the continued reliance on rhetoric as substitute for fundamental reforms can have only one result: the far more rapid and pervasive growth of alienation, apathy, drugs, delinquency, and violence among the young and not so young in all segments of our national life. We face the prospect of a society which resents its own children and fears its youth.* Surely this is a road to national destruction.

This is not the road for America. Our society still has the capacity and the value commitment necessary to reverse the trend. What is needed is a change in our patterns of living which will once again bring people back into the lives of children and children back into the lives of people.

The Solution

Forum 15 proposes a series of measures to accomplish these ends. The measures can be undertaken by many different parts of our society, including Federal, state, and local government, the community, schools, employers, the mass media, and the advertising industry. The recommendations serve five major objectives:

To enhance the dignity and status of families and children in all phases of American life. Particular, but not exclusive, attention must be given economically or socially disadvantaged families.

To increase opportunities for parents, other adults, and older children to engage in meaningful activities with the young at home, in the neighborhood, in preschool settings, in schools, and in the community at large.

To enhance the ability, responsibility, and power of parents—and of their children as they mature—to choose and influence the kinds of environments in which their children are growing up, including neighborhoods, preschools, health and welfare services, schools, churches, mass media, and recreational facilities.

To provide children with opportunities to accept challenging responsibilities in work and service in school, neighborhood, and community.

To grant children, especially teenagers, a greater measure of influence and control over activities and programs that affect them in their schools, neighborhoods, and communities.

To enhance the dignity, status, and self-image of all those who carry responsibility for the care and education of children in our society.

General Recommendations

Reordering of National Priorities

We call for a reordering of priorities at all levels of American society so that children and families come first. At the national level, we recommend that the proportion of our Gross National Product devoted to public expenditure for children and youth be increased by at least 50 percent during the next decade, and that the proportion of the Federal budget devoted to children be at least doubled during that period. We recommend that an annual income at the level necessary to meet the needs of children be guaranteed to every family in the nation. Support for families should be provided to the family as a unit, without prejudice against variant family structures and with recognition of differing cultural values and traditions. This call for a reordering of priorities is addressed to all levels of our society: government, business, industry, mass media, communities, schools, churches, neighborhoods, and individual citizens.

Bring People Back into the Lives of Children

We must change our national way of life so that children are no longer isolated from the rest of society. We call upon all our institutions—public and private—to initiate and expand programs that will bring adults back into the lives of children and children back into the lives of adults. This means the reinvolvement of children of all ages with parents and other

adults in common activities and responsibilities. It means parent-and-child centers as opposed to child development centers. It means breaking down the wall between school and community. It means new flexibility for schools, business, and industries so that children and adults can spend time together and become acquainted with each other's worlds at work and at play. It means family-directed community planning, services, and recreation programs. It means the reinvolvement of children and adults in each other's lives.

Comprehensive Family-oriented Child Development Programs

We recommend that the Federal government fund comprehensive child care programs, which will be family-centered, locally controlled, and universally available, with initial priority to those whose needs are greatest. These programs should provide for active participation of family members in the development and implementation of the program. These programs—including health, early childhood education, and social services—should have sufficient variety to ensure that families can select the options most appropriate to their needs. A major educational program should also be provided to inform the public about the elements essential for quality in child care services about the inadequacies of custodial care, about the importance of child care services as a supplement, not a substitute, for the family as the primary agent for the child's development as a human being.

Department of Family and Children

Acknowledging that the family is society's primary unit for developing human potential and transmitting cultural heritage, we charge parents and children with enhancing their own abilities and responsibilities in their family lives.

We recommend that a Department of the Family and Children with the status of a cabinet post and councils and commissions on state and local levels be established and adequately funded. We also recommend the permanent establishment and Federal funding of the Office of Child Development. These should be responsible for:

Coordinating services to families and children

Reconstructing old programs

Developing new programs and performing other functions, such as convening a White House Conference on families and children at least every five years with ongoing activities in states and local communities with children participating at all levels; supporting policies which provide for part-time employment without discrimination for parents who wish to spend more time with their children; and assuring the right of all children to have legally responsible, permanent parents.

Recommendations for the Community

The power of the family to function effectively depends in large measure on the support to family life provided by the local community. The following recommendations are designed to ensure and increase such support.

Council for Families and Children

We recommend that every community or local area establish a Council for Families and Children to have as its initial charge determining what the community is doing, or not doing, for its children and their families. The council would examine the adequacy of existing programs such as maternal and child health services, day care facilities, and recreational opportunities. It

would also investigate what places and people are available to children when they are not in school; what opportunities they have for play, challenging activity, or useful work; and to whom they can turn for guidance or assistance.

The council would also assess the existing and needed resources in the community that provide families with positive learning, living, and leisure opportunities that lend themselves to pleasant, stimulating, human experiences for the members of families to enjoy together. The council would raise the questions: "How do families spend their leisure time?" "Can the community sponsor events and projects that are within the means of every family in the community?" "Could these experiences add to the positive identification of an individual as a valued family member and as an important community member?"

To accomplish its task, the council would need to include representatives of the major community institutions concerned with children and families, such as schools, churches, welfare services, businessmen, parents from different segments of the community, and, especially, teen-agers and older children who can speak from direct experience. The council would be expected to report its findings and recommendations to appropriate executive bodies and to the public at large through the mass media. After completing the initial assessment phase, the council would assume continuing responsibility for developing and monitoring programs to implement its recommendations.

Family Members Participating in Policy Bodies

Family members should have a voice in all programs and policies affecting their welfare. Young people become responsible by being given, and held accountable for, responsibilities that really matter to them. In keeping with these principles, every community organization that has jurisdiction over activities affecting children and youth should include some teen-agers, older children, and parents as voting members. This would include such organizations as school boards, welfare commissions, recreation commissions, and hospital boards.

The Neighborhood Family Centers

Families are strengthened through association with each other in common activities and responsibilities. For this to occur, there must be a place where families can meet to work and play together. The Neighborhood Family Center is such a place. Located in a school, church, or other community building, it provides a focal point for leisure and learning and community problem solving to all family members. The center offers facilities for games and creative activities that could be engaged in by persons of all ages with space for those who prefer merely to "watch the fun." To eliminate fragmentation of services, the center can also serve as the local "one door" entry point for obtaining family services in areas such as health, child care, legal aid, and welfare. The center differs from the traditional community center in emphasizing cross-age rather than age-segregated activities. In addition to the Family Neighborhood Center, the community should provide other recreation facilities and programs in which cross-age activities can take place (for example, family camps, fairs, games, picnics, etc.).

Community and Neighborhood Projects

The community, as a family to the families within it, has the responsibility to provide activities which enable different generations to have contact and become a significant part of each other's lives. Through community sponsored projects, individuals of all ages can grow in their appreciation of each other as they learn

to give to one another through a sharing of their talents and skills. The growing interest in ecology—cleaning up the environment—provides an excellent focus for such common endeavors, since it requires a variety of knowledge, skills, and services.

Recommendations for the School

The school plays a central role in the lives of children and their parents in American society. As a result, it is in a position to do much either to enhance or to weaken relationships between children and adults. With few exceptions, schools, as they are organized and operated today, increase the separation of children from their parents and other adults in the community. The school does this by isolating children in age-graded groups under the supervision of teachers who are enmeshed in regulations that prevent them from acting effectively as intermediaries between pupils and the community in which the school exists. The result is to intensify the alienation of young people, not only from the school, but from adult society at large.

The following recommendations are based on the fundamental premise that children cannot learn about the adult world, nor adults about children, unless they interact with each other. Our recommendations are aimed at helping the school take fullest advantage of its considerable opportunities to build bridges between children and adults.

Connecting School with Community

The school and, more specifically, teachers should assume central responsibility for establishing and maintaining meaningful relationships between children and adults in all walks of life. This will involve:

Extending the physical and psychological boundaries of the school to include the community at large.

Radically altering current conceptions of school curricula to incorporate and acknowledge the educational value of continuing interactions between children and adults involved in a variety of occupational and social roles.

Central to this recommendation is the principle that teachers be encouraged to serve as links between the children and persons and activities in the surrounding community. Teachers can do this in the following ways:

By making arrangements for children to spend time, during the school day, outside school under the supervision of other adults engaged in a variety of occupational and social roles. These contacts and experiences must provide an opportunity for children to engage in interaction with adults over time. A simple example would be the "adoption" of an entire class by a police precinct, local industrial firm, or other adult organization. Children would visit regularly for prolonged periods of time, usually without their teacher, thereby widening their knowledge of adults beyond family and school. In the course of these associations, learning by both the children and their adult sponsors would take place.

By making arrangements for adults in the community to participate actively in the school's instructional program. The purpose of such participation must be different from the occasional vocational counseling programs currently conducted by schools using outside personnel. The primary objective would be to acquaint pupils with adults in their roles as productive members of society.

To give a fuller picture of what human beings can become, participants should be selected not only to reflect a variety of occupations but also civic responsibilities and avocations, such as hobbies and artistic skills. In addition, persons possessing subject matter skills—writing, languages, mathematics, or science—should be encouraged to assist in supervising special projects, tutoring, and grading both in and out of school.

Developing School Policies and Curricula

American schools are a public institution. In keeping with the objective of enabling family members to have a strong voice in determining the programs affecting the lives of their children, schools should develop mechanisms for actively involving both parents and children in formulating policies and curricula responsive to the values, aspirations, and cultural backgrounds of the families to whom the school is ultimately responsible.

Changing Educational Requirements

School boards, state boards of education, and other responsible bodies must revise existing regulations and curriculum requirements to permit schools and teachers in schools to make these new kinds of educational experiences available to children. In addition, questions of legal responsibility, including liability for injury and the provision of insurance coverage for outside groups, must be resolved through appropriate Federal and state legislation.

Involvement of Children in Challenging Responsibilities

America has been referred to as a society characterized by the "inutility of children." Our children are not entrusted with any real responsibilities in their family, neighborhood, or community. Little that they do really matters. When they do participate, it is in some inconsequential undertaking. They are given duties rather than responsibilities; that is, the ends and means have been determined by someone else, and their job is to fulfill an assignment involving little judgment, decision making, or risk. The latter remain within the purview of supervising adults. Although this policy serves the interest of children by protecting them from burdens beyond their years, evidence suggests that it has been carried too far in our contemporary society and has contributed to the alienation and alleged incapacity of young people to deal constructively with personal and social problems. Children acquire the capacity to cope with difficult social situations when they have been given opportunities to take on consequential responsibilities and are held accountable for them. *We recommend that the school provide children with such opportunities (as distinguished from "duties") in both the school and, especially, in the surrounding community.*

The children should have an active part in defining what the problems are in their school and their community and what their responsibility is or should become in contributing to their solution. Within the school, this implies greater involvement of children in formulating and enforcing codes of behavior and in planning and developing activities in the classroom. This should ensure that the burden of maintaining discipline does not fall solely, or even primarily, on the shoulders of the teacher, who is then freed to perform her primary function of expanding the children's horizon and range of competence. Outside the school, the pupils should take on projects, both as individuals and groups, dealing with concrete problems which they themselves have identified—for example, "cleaning up the environment" or other service projects. Particularly important are activities involving care and responsibility for younger children (as discussed in the succeeding recommendation).

Functional Education for Parenthood

At the present time, American schools give only minimal attention to the one sphere of activity which almost all their graduates will share as adults—parenthood. Where parent education does occur, it is typically presented in vicarious forms, through reading and discussion, or, at best, role playing rather than actual role taking. *Programs are needed which involve all family members, including children, in problems such as family management, decision making, and consumer education.* Excellent preparation for parenthood can be given to school-age children through direct experience, under appropriate supervision, in caring for and working with those younger than themselves. From the elementary grades onward, children should be given the opportunity (but not the "duty") to engage in these activities. For example, an entire class might be invited to "adopt" a kindergarten, day care group, or Head Start center as a means of becoming acquainted with the children, playing with them, teaching them games, helping escort them on outings or to and from their homes, and getting to know their parents. For older children, the activities would be extended to include helping with subject matter skills, supervising special projects, and providing guidance and leadership in recreational and civic activities.

Attachment of Preschool Programs to Schools

To implement these recommendations, we recommend that Head Start centers, day care facilities, and other programs for young children be located in or near schools, be integrated with the school curriculum, and serve as laboratories in which young people and adults alike can learn about children and experience the rewards of seeing and contributing to their development. This objective will be defeated if the schools impose their current philosophy and mode of operation on preschool programs. It is therefore essential that the administration of preschool programs be substantially independent of the school and provide a decisive role for parents in the planning of policy and programs.

Recommendations for the Employer

To an extent not generally recognized, the patterns of life of American families are influenced by employment policies and practice. Employers, both public and private, can make a significant contribution to placing families and children at the center rather than the periphery of our national life by such measures as:

Recognizing their role in influencing the way American families live

Changing the organization and demands of work in ways which will enable children and parents to live and learn together

Actively providing opportunities, resources, and facilities that will increase the involvement of parents and all employees in the lives of children in the community

Developing ways for children and youth to engage in meaningful acitvitics in the world of adults.

Reevaluation of Employer Policies and Practices

At both central and local levels, industries, businesses, and government offices should examine present policies and practices of the organization as they affect family life. Particular attention, with a view to possible modification, should be accorded the following: out-of-town, week-end, and overnight obligations; frequency and timing of geographical moves; flexibility of work schedules; leave and rest privileges for maternal and child care; job-related social obligations; day care facilities; and number and status of part-time positions.

67-582 O - 71 - 11

Children and Adults in the World of Work

The need "to bring people back into the lives of children and children back into the lives of people" is especially relevant for business and industry. Although for many years business and industrial organizations have engaged in activities involving children (for example, plant tours, Junior Achievement programs, and public service by employees), most programs of this kind do not lead to continuing relationships between children and adults. As an example of an innovation which can add an entirely new dimension to the involvement of adults with children, *we recommend that business firms or subdivisions consider inviting children in the community to spend time at the place of work getting to know the staff and employees as people.* For example, employees could invite a school classroom, day care facility, Head Start program, or Boy Scout troop to spend time at their place of work, to become their friends, and learn not only about the specific jobs they do, but also about them as people. In return, the employees would come to know children on a new basis by taking an active interest in the day-to-day activities of "their" children and their parents. We are not suggesting that organizations employ children, or exploit them in any way, but rather that, as a matter of civic responsibility, employers should experiment with new ways of establishing close and continuing relationships with children and families in their communities. In all instances the program should be carried out with the consent, and, wherever possible, the active involvement of parents and other family members.

A concrete example of how such an innovative program might work is provided by a film produced by Forum 15 for presentation at the White House Conference. Entitled "A Place to Meet, A Way to Understand," the film documents an experiment carried on in cooperation with the Detroit Free Press in which sixth-graders from two public schools—one in a slum area, the other in a middle-class neighborhood—spent most of the day for several days in the various shops and offices of the newspaper—press room, city room, composing room, and advertising department.

Revision of Work Laws Affecting Children and Families

To facilitate knocking down barriers to the reinvolvement of children with adults, we urge:

Reexamination and revision of child labor laws to eliminate unnecessary restrictions that presently preclude the development of programs that would enable children to become acquainted with the world of work and to participate in informal apprenticeship experiences.

Provision of low cost insurance to cover liability of employers who wish to develop programs for acquainting children with the world of work.

Reexamination and revision of licensing requirements for children's institutions and programs so as to remove barriers to, and enhance the participation of, parents and paraprofessionals in the program.

Drafting and passage of a Fair Part-Time Employment Practices Act which would prohibit discrimination in job opportunity, income, or status for persons with family responsibilities desiring part-time employment.

Family-oriented Industrial Planning and Development

To an ever increasing degree, business establishments determine not only where and how employees work but also where and how their families live. Decisions on plant or office location influence in

substantial measure the kinds of housing, schools, and neighborhoods that become available to employees and their children. Indeed, more and more large organizations are involved in planning and building the housing projects and even the entire communities in which their employees live. Such plans should give explicit consideration to factors which influence the course of family life, specifically those which provide or preclude opportunities for active participation of parents and other adults in the lives of the children and vice-versa. This includes such factors as commuting, traffic safety, location of shops and businesses where children could have contact with adults at work, recreational and day care facilities readily accessible to parents as well as children, provisions for a Family Neighborhood Center and other family oriented facilities and services described in this report.

Recommendations for the Mass Media and the Advertising Industry

American children and adults spend an average of twenty-seven hours a week watching television.(1) In addition, they spend considerable amounts of time reading newspapers and magazines and listening to radio. There are disagreements as to the precise effects of television on the lives of those who watch it, but there is no doubt as to its enormous influence. The mass media must therefore bear a heavy burden of responsibility for the well-being of our society. The media recognize this in their code of ethics, but their current practices contribute significantly to the undermining of the American family. Watching television is an individual activity requiring no interaction with others. Therefore, as television viewing rises, communication within the family tends to decrease. A radical new concept of television is required, one that both in content and in style recognizes the importance of the family and encourages interaction among family members.

"Interactive" Television

Urgent attention should be paid to the creation of an entirely new kind of television programming, one which no longer casts the viewer in the role of passive and isolated bystander but instead involves family members in activities with each other in games, conversation, and joint creative activity. There is nothing inherent in television technology which precludes this possibility.

Public Service Advertising

Leaders of the advertising industry should join with representatives of the mass media to develop and give wide exposure to a nationwide advertising campaign designed to enhance the status of children and parents in American life, to provide concrete examples of family-oriented activities and programs, and to show how such activities can be fun for both children and their parents.

Eliminating Exploitation in Advertising

One of the most destructive manifestations of the low priority accorded children and families in American society is the way in which advertisements in the mass media exploit the child and his family for commercial purposes. For example, a child is shown urging his mother to buy a particular product. It is the direct responsibility of the mass media and their clients to identify and eliminate this practice wherever it occurs.

Criterion for Licensing of Transmitters

Radio and television stations are obligated to perform public service as a condition for operation. We recommend that contribution to the quality of family life be stipulated as an explicit criterion for reviewing and retaining a license.

Recommendations of Forum Workshops

At the request of Forum delegates, the following additional recommendations developed by Forum 15 workshops are included.

The Family

We affirm that the social institution "the family" in all its varied

forms is the major force in society in developing physically, emotionally, socially, spiritually, and intellectually healthy children. *Therefore our nation should invest its attention, energies, and resources to provide new programs and to reconstruct old programs which avoid fragmenting the family but which enhance the quality of life of the family as a whole.*

Promote Interaction

We recommend that major educational opportunities be provided to promote interaction between parents and children and between children of different ages within the context of the life of the family and its community, specifically:

Greater use of school facilities for all parents and other adults

Use of community resources in the education and learning experience of the child by the schools

Integration of community resources for the purpose of bringing parents, children, and other members of the community together

Fulfillment of parental responsibilities by taking an active part in the development of school policy and planning of school curricula

New emphasis on teacher training in preparation for greater community control or participation

Opportunities for meaningful service available to children, such as tutoring younger children; for involvement in the internal organization of the school and for outlining problems in the school and in helping to effect change

Families be urged to select a time each week to hold a family council in which all family members will participate in a discussion of family concerns and problems.

The Family in Society

Since a family is not an isolated unit and is affected by forces, elements, and institutions of society, we recommend:

Greater participation of children in policy making, beginning with the family and working on up through the community level.

Flexible scheduling in industry and school to facilitate greater participation in family and community life.

Cooperation by community organizations in the establishment of family relations programs in schools, businesses, and industries.

Parent-Child Relationship

Recognizing the uniqueness of the parent-child relationship, we affirm:

That it is the right of all children to live with legally responsible and permanent parents. New legislation should be enacted to limit temporary custody of children to very brief periods of time, with frequent reevaluation; provide needed services to children in their own homes, and to give these services priority over any form of placement of children; require that placement be family-centered, community oriented, and free from restrictive and irrelevant adoption requirements.

The rights of children to be responsibly involved in the family, school, church, and work areas and enlist the cooperation of officials in government, education, religion, business, industry and

251

labor in reexamining their policies and restrictions on children's involvement

Our concern for the separation of children from parents and other adults, and underscore the responsibility of all community leaders to consider the parent-child relationship in their planning

The needs for strengthening family relationships through moral and spiritual values and urge that religious-oriented organizations be increasingly responsive to family needs and interactions

That the recognition of the dignity and status of families is crucial to sound family function, and that both national and local efforts be initiated with this recognition as their goal.

Minority Report of Forum 15 by Forum Chairman Urie Bronfenbrenner

I take issue with the accompanying document on two major counts.

First, the report, in my judgment, fails to convey the urgency and severity of the problem confronting the nation's families and their children. Second, the document underestimates and consequently fails to alert the reader to the critical role played by business and industry—both private and public—in determining the life style of the American family and the manner in which parents and children are treated in American society. I shall speak to each of these points in turn.

The National Neglect of Children

The working draft of the original Forum 15 Task Force report began with the following statement:

America's families, and their children, are in trouble, trouble so deep and pervasive as to threaten the future of our nation. The source of the trouble is nothing less than a national neglect of children and those primarily engaged in their care—America's parents.

The Editorial Committee objected to this statement on the grounds that it applied only to a minority of the nation's children and that, therefore, no note of urgency was justified. I strongly disagree.

One does not dismiss an epidemic as no threat to the nation's health merely because, as of the moment, only a minority of the nation's children has been stricken by disease. To assess danger, and to avert it, one must be aware not only of where we are, but in what direction we are moving. From this perspective, the picture is hardly reassuring. The evidence indicates that American society, whether viewed in comparison to other nations or to itself over time, is according progressively less attention to its children. The trend is already apparent when the child is born. America, the richest and most powerful country in the world, stands thirteenth among the nations in combating infant mortality.(2) Even East Germany does better. Moreover, our ranking has dropped steadily in recent decades.(3) The situation is similar with respect to maternal and child health, day care, children's allowances, and other basic services to children and families.

But the figures for the nation as a whole, dismaying as they are, mask even greater inequities. For example, infant mortality for non-whites in the United States is almost twice that for whites, and in several states the ratios are considerably higher.(4) Ironically, of even greater cost to the society than the infants who

die are the many more who sustain injury but survive with some disability. Many of these suffer impaired intellectual function and behavioral disturbance including hyperactivity, distractibility, and low attention span, all factors contributing to school retardation and problem behavior. Again, the destructive impact is greatest on the poorest segments of the population, especially non-whites. It is all the more tragic that this massive damage, and its subsequent cost in reduced productivity, lower income, unemployability, welfare payments, and institutionalization, are avoidable if adequate family and child services are provided, as they are in a number of countries less prosperous than ours.

But it is not only children from disadvantaged families who show signs of progressive neglect. For example, a survey by this writer of changes in child-rearing practices in the United States over a 25-year period reveals a decrease, especially in recent years, in all spheres of interaction between parent and child. A similar conclusion is indicated by data from cross-cultural studies comparing American parents with those from Western and Eastern Europe. Moreover, as parents and other adults move out of the lives of children, the vacuum is filled by the age-segregated peer group. Recently, my colleagues and I completed a study showing that, at every age and grade level, children today show a greater dependence on their peers than they did a decade ago. Our evidence indicates that susceptibility to group influence is higher among children from homes in which one or both parents are frequently absent. In addition, "peer-oriented" youngsters describe their parents as less affectionate and less firm in discipline. Attachment to age mates appears to be influenced more by a lack of attention and concern at home than by any positive attraction of the peer group itself. In fact, these children have a rather negative view of their friends and of themselves as well. They are pessimistic about the future, rate lower on such traits as responsibility and leadership, and are more likely to engage in such antisocial behavior as lying, teasing other children, "playing hooky," or "doing something illegal." In short, we see here the roots of alienation and its milder consequences. The more serious manifestations are reflected in the rising rates of youthful drug abuse, delinquency, and violence documented in charts and tables specially prepared for the White House Conference.(5) According to these data, the proportion of youngsters between ages 10 and 18 arrested for drug abuse doubled between 1964 and 1968; since 1963, juvenile deliquency has been increasing at a faster rate than the juvenile population; over half the crimes involve vandalism, theft, or breaking and entry; and, if present trends continue, one out of every nine youngsters will appear in juvenile court before age 18. These figures index only detected and prosecuted offenses. How high must they run before we acknowledge that they reflect deep and pervasive problems in the treatment of children and youth in our society?

The Critical Effect of Business on Family Life

In the original Task Force report, the first and longest series of recommendations was addressed to business, industry, and government as employers. In the present document, this section has been drastically reduced and relegated to an inconspicuous position in the total report. Yet, it is American business and industry, more than any other institution in our society, that has the opportunity of determining the fate of the American family and the American child. More than any other institution, they have the power to reverse the present trend and to place families and children at the center rather than the periphery of our national life. They can do so by:

253

Recognizing the full measure of their responsibility for the way in which families are forced to live

Changing the organization and demands of work in such a way as to make it possible for children and parents to live and learn together

Actively providing opportunities, resources, and facilities that will increase the involvement of parents and all employees in the lives of children in the community

Developing ways for children and youth to engage in meaningful activities in the world of adults.

Specifically, the Planning Committee for Forum 15 originally recommended the following measures in addition to those covered in the majority report.

Minimizing Out-of-town, Weekend, and Evening Obligations

A parent who cannot be at home when his children are, no matter how excellent he may be in other respects, cannot fulfill his role as a parent. And the organization that keeps him away is undermining the welfare of his children. The introduction of a family-oriented personnel policy which minimizes such obligations would not only counteract these effects but—if offered as a fringe benefit—would help attract and hold more able personnel, for the most capable and responsible staff are also likely to be those who care most about their families.

Reducing Geographic Moves

The policy followed by some large organizations of transferring personnel every few years from one city or region to another is highly disruptive to family life. The impact is hardest on children, since healthy psychological development requires some degree of stability and continuity in the social environment from childhood through adolescence. A pattern of life which repeatedly tears the child away from familiar friends, schools, and neighborhoods increases the likelihood of the child's alienation both inside and outside the family. Accordingly, moves should be kept to a minimum.

Increasing Number and Status of Part-time Positions

We recommend that business and industrial organizations and government agencies increase the number and status of part-time positions so that employees who wish to give a larger part of their time and energy to parenthood or other activities with children can do so without sacrificing their career opportunities and rate of income.

Leave and Rest Privileges for Maternal and Child Care

Business and industrial organizations share with other institutions in society responsibility for the birth of a healthy child. In view of the cost to society of welfare and institutionalization of children born with prenatal damage, these organizations have the obligation to develop policies of leave and rest for mothers during pregnancy and early months of infant care without jeopardy to their employment or income status.

Day Care Facilities

To increase opportunities for parents and other employees to spend time with their children, day care facilities should be established within or near the place of work, but with completely independent administrative arrangements which allow parents a determining voice in the planning and execution of the program. Parents and other employees should be encouraged to visit the day care facility during the lunch hour or coffee breaks and to participate in activities with the children.

254

Although these recommendations are primarily designed to benefit children and families, experienced managers and labor leaders will also recognize them as good business. For example, contrary to commonly held views, studies of part-time workers in several occupations and industries reveal a gain rather than a loss of *quality and quantity of production*. Similarly, implementation of these recommendations can be expected to counteract two of the most serious and growing problems in the nation's economy—high rates of turnover and absenteeism.

References

1. Nielsen TV Index, Winter 1979.

2. See *Profiles of Children*, Table 14.

3. Except as otherwise noted, the comparative data cited in this commentary are documented in Bronfenbrenner, U., *Two Worlds of Childhood* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation 1970). See especially pp. 88–104.

4. See *Profiles of Children*, Tables 13, 15, 17.

5. *Ibid*, Charts 137, 140; Tables 48, 140, 150.

Forum No. 10 Members

Urie Bronfenbrenner (Chairman)

Eleanore B. Luckey (Vice Chairman)

Jeffrey Cash

Dorothy W. Cotton

Dorothy Farley

David A. Gwills

David Herbert

E. L. Horne

Richard E. Johnson

Karla Kalsa

Robert J. Levy

Maurice Martin

Alan F. Monroe

David E. Wise

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN
REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT
(Selected Excerpts)

Report of Forum 16
Family Planning and Family Economics

Family Economics

The primary consideration in family living is the quality of life for each family member. To develop practices conducive to sustaining the dignity and self-worth basic to human well-being, families must have the opportunity to assess and plan for family life in the home and community, including health, education, and employment. But no family can either plan or function adequately when financial resources are so limited that no options exist for choice or private decisions. Economic security is fundamental to supportive family life.

No family should be forced to subsist on funds determined less than adequate by current budget standards (such as those available from the United States Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, or other governmental agency). Where the efforts of the individual family cannot adequately provide this standard, it becomes the responsibility of the larger society through the Federal government. The costs of failing to meet this responsibility are intolerable: the multiple handicaps that afflict children born and raised in poverty last a lifetime—lifetimes of poor health, poor housing, poor education, and poor self-esteem.

The following assumptions underlie our discussion of family economics:

Without reasonable economic security, planning for improved family living in other areas is not possible.

Maximum employment opportunities are essential to human dignity.

A Federally financed and administered system of income support, geared to the cost of living, must be legislated.

260

An acceptable minimum wage must be established throughout the nation for all jobs.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN
REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT
(Selected Excerpts)

Report of Forum 17
Developmental Child Care Services

Introduction

The members and delegates of this Forum (representing private, state, local, and parent organizations, business, and private industry throughout the nation) are shocked at the lack of national attention to the critical developmental needs of children. We urge the recognition of day care as a developmental service with tremendous potential for positively influencing and strengthening the lives of children and families, and we urge the eradication of day care as only a custodial, "baby-sitting" service.

The fundamental issue is how we can arrange for the optimal nurturance of today's children at a time of profound change in the American family and its living conditions. The responses to the changing needs of children, families, and communities have been a variety of part-time child care arrangements outside the family. Too many of these ideas and experiments are isolated from each other and from existing community resources. Too often, thought about such programs is fragmented into restricted concepts—nursery schools, babysitting, preschool enrichment centers, or child care service for parents in job training. These programs are not a full solution, but are individual responses to parts of a general and growing national need for supplementary child care services.

Although this paper considers the broad range of needs, it focuses on developmental child care which we define as any care, supervision, and developmental opportunity for children which supplements parental care and guidance. The responsibility for such supplementary care is delegated by parents (or guardians) and generally provided in their absence; however, the home and family remain the central focus of the child's life. Parents must retain the primary responsibility for rearing their children; but society, in turn, must recognize its role in the ultimate responsibility for the child's well-being and development.

Developmental child care should meet not only normal supervisory, physical, health, and safety needs, but should also provide for the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical growth and development of the child with opportunities for parental involvement and participation. Day care can be provided in public and private day care centers, Head Start programs, nursery schools, day nurseries, kindergartens, and family day care homes, as well as before and after school, and during vacations.

Child care is a service for all children—infants, toddlers, preschoolers, and school-age children. Regardless of the hours, the auspices, the funding source, the name of the service, or the child's age, the program should be judged by its success in helping each child develop tools for learning and growing, both in relation to his own life style and abilities and in the context of the larger culture surrounding him.

The Need: Some Data

Many forces are converging to accelerate the need for day care: female employment; family mobility; urbanization; community mobilization to fight poverty; the rise in single-parent families through divorce, separation, or other causes; pressures to reduce the public welfare burden; and realization of the needs and opportunities for early education in the broadest sense.

The most direct force is the growing number of employed women. Since the beginning of World War II, mothers have increased almost eightfold.(1) Today half of the nation's mothers with school-age children are working at least part-time (a third with

273

children under six years), (2) and by the 1980 White House Conference on Children, working mothers of preschool children alone are expected to increase by over one and one-half million. (3) Although the primary motive for women to work is economic —to provide or help provide food, housing, medical care, and education for their families (4)—increasing numbers of women work for the personal satisfaction of using their education, skills, and creativity. Many more women, often those with critically needed skills, such as nurses, would work if they could be sure of adequate care for their children. (5) More women are demanding more choices in their lives: choices in parenthood, in jobs, and in family roles. The result—more than twelve million children under fourteen had mothers working at least part-time in 1965; four and one-half million of these children were under six.

What happened to those children while their mothers worked? Thirteen percent required no supplementary care since their mothers worked only while they were in school. For the remaining eighty-seven percent, a variety of arrangements were used. Forty-six percent were cared for at home by the father, another adult relative, a sibling (often a child himself), or someone paid to come into the home. Fifteen percent were cared for by their mothers on the job, and sixteen percent were cared for away from home, half by a relative and half in small "family day care homes." Only two percent of the children received group care in a day care center or nursery school, and eight percent received no care at all (including 18,000 preschoolers). (6) These percentages vary, of course, for the different age groups. The complete picture of supplementary care must also include the hundreds of thousands of children attending nursery school whose mothers do not work. (7)

If all these care arrangements were adequate, we would have to worry only about the almost one million "latch-key" children who received no care. But many of these care arrangements do not even assure immediate physical safety, as child accident rates show. We know very little of the quality of care given by non-maternal sources in the home, but of the outside arrangements, far too many are unlicensed, unsupervised, and chosen because they are the only available care alternative. Even the many dedicated women who put effort and love into their "family care" or nursery school often lack the training and the educational, medical, physical, and financial resources to meet the needs of a growing child. A recent nationwide survey of child care has turned up far too many horrifying examples of children neglected and endangered in both licensed and unlicensed centers. (8) In a study of New York City, 80 percent of the known and inspected day care homes were rated as inadequate. (9) Since the major failings were related to inadequate resources and physical facilities and since the homes were in the child's neighborhood, it is reasonable to assume that other neighborhood home care sites, including the child's own home, would rate no better using the same criteria.

The dramatic rise in the need for child care services caused by changing employment patterns has partly overshadowed the great needs evident since well before the first White House Conference on Children in 1910. Special programs are required to serve the needs of children suffering emotional disturbance, mental retardation, cerebral palsy, and other handicaps; to assist families with such children by relieving the parents of some of the burdens of full-time care; and to help strengthen families in difficult situations by offering child care and attention perhaps otherwise

unobtainable. These needs still exist, and in large numbers. Over eleven percent of school-age children have emotional problems requiring some type of mental health service. (10) The vast majority of these five million children, and preschoolers with similar problems, can be treated by trained professionals and paraprofessionals "working in settings not primarily established for treatment of mental illness." (11) Three million persons under the age of 20 are mentally retarded; with adequate training and continued support, most could learn to care for themselves, but special education classes reach only a quarter of those needing them. (12) Similarly, many of the thousands of families with children handicapped by blindness, cerebral palsy, and other disorders, are unable to find the necessary assistance in caring for their children. Partly in response to these facts, the recent Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children recommended the "creation or enlargement of day care and preschool programs" as a major preventive service, with an important potential role in crisis intervention and treatment services. (13) These programs, they said, should be "available as a *public utility* to all children." (14)

For all these needs, about 640,000 spaces for children presently exist in licensed day care homes and centers. But this number compares to a need estimated at several million. (15) Even though the number of places has risen rapidly in the past five years —from 250,000 to 640,000—the total picture has improved little; while the 400,000 places were being added, the number of children under age six whose mothers were working increased by 800,000. (16)

Answers Old and New

The social institutions traditionally responsible for child care have generally treated the new needs simply as more of the old. For decades, "day care" has been part of "child welfare," where it has been "tended by a devoted few, condescended to by many." It is still widely believed that only mothers on the verge of destitution seek employment and outside care for their children; that only disintegrated families, where parents are unfit to give even minimal care, seek outside support. The need for supplementary child care is often viewed as the result of other pathology in the family, its use justified only in forestalling greater disaster for the child. (17)

The child welfare concept of day care—as a service to poor and problem families—has contributed to the resistance to enlarging services to cover broader segments of the population. Inadequately funded and primarily concerned with the care and protection of children, agencies have usually responded by creating supervised centers for care, and/or promoting additional regulation and licensing of less formal child care arrangements.

Both approaches have failed to meet the current demand for day care arrangements. Although thousands of families are unable to find care for their children, some group care centers show serious under-enrollment. One study found that nearly three-quarters of the centers in one city had spaces available; the same study found only 250 officially approved and licensed day care homes serving the community, compared to several thousand women providing care in informal and unregulated arrangements. (18)

The reasons that the traditional responses have touched only a minor part of the present supplementary child care needs are

complex, but include lack of community understanding of, and commitment to child care, inadequate community coordination and information on available programs, the high cost of center care, and parental preference for convenient and personal arrangements. This points to a need for sponsoring agencies to be flexible and responsive to family needs. Families must be encouraged to understand and seek quality care. The needs and uses of child care services have changed more rapidly than our understanding of the situation and our ability to respond to it.

The point is that developmental child care is no longer needed primarily to buttress disintegrating families. Economics, divorce, education, cultural values, and other factors have led to a variety of family situations. The working mother is no longer a "misfit," and the family is not the simple mother-father-child picture usually assumed. By the end of this decade, it is possible that most American children will have working mothers, and there is no reason to think these mothers will be less concerned than other mothers about the care their children receive, or that their employment will, of itself, lead to destructive deviations from normal parent-child relationships. (19)

Because the primary need for child care is to help functioning families lead more satisfying lives, and not to replace families, services which are not responsive to the variety of family needs will not be adequate. We must understand the process by which families choose a particular child care arrangement. In general, they are looking for supplementary care that is flexible in hours, reasonable in cost, convenient in location, and, often last, dependable in quality. (20) The challenge we face is to develop a system of services with at least three effects: making parents more aware of quality in child care programs; assisting parents in maintaining their parental responsibilities; and delivering good care to all children, regardless of the specific arrangement.

Although as a nation we lack an adequate system of developmental child care services, many local efforts have been fruitful during the past decades. Thousands of children and families have benefited from the programs developed and sponsored by church groups, parent cooperatives, community organizations, and small proprietary operations. As more services are developed, the progress and wisdom gained from successful efforts must not be lost.

A New Force: Child Development

Next to the growing number of employed women, the second force in the increasing demand for making available supplementary child care to all citizens grows out of recent discoveries on the importance of early experience on human growth and development. Psychologists, pediatricians, psychiatrists, educators, nutritionists, anthropologists, and other investigators continue to document the critical significance of the first years of life. The central finding is that during the years when a child's body, intellect, and psyche are developing most rapidly, his conditions of life will profoundly influence his later health, motivations, intelligence, self-image, and relations to other people. (21)

Every moment of a child's life is learning—what he can and cannot do, what adults expect and think of him, what people need and like and hate, what his role in society will be. His best chances for a satisfying and constructive adulthood grow from a satisfying and constructive childhood and infancy.

276

Sound development cannot be promoted too early, for the early

experiences will be either supportive or destructive. The President's commission on Mental Retardation estimated that three-quarters of mental retardation in America could not be related directly to genetics (such as mongolism or Down's syndrome), physical damage, or other organic factors and was typically associated with geographic areas, where health care, nutrition, and developmental opportunities are usually minimal. (22)

One reason why many social institutions formerly resisted extra-familial child care was their deep belief in the importance of family life and fear of the possibly destructive results of separating a child from his mother. The institutional syndrome of maternal deprivation found in many orphanages was attributed to any separation from the biological mother, rather than to prolonged separation combined with other institutional conditions such as perceptual monotony; little interaction with adults; and lack of a basis for self, family, and historical identity. Traditional guidelines viewed day care as a last resort because the institutional findings were over-generalized to include the part-time—and very different—separation involved in day care, where the child returns daily to the family.(23)

While it remains supremely important to ensure against deprivation of adult care, it now appears that with adequate planning even full day care can sustain the emotional adjustment of infants and leave intact their attachment to the mother. (24) In addition, it is becoming clear that day care holds an important potential for providing all children with "the essentials of experience" which support optimal development. Although until recently few attempts were made to evaluate objectively the efforts of full day care, abundant research documents the possibility of desirable effects associated with some variety of experience outside the home which involves careful planning of the environment for the young child. (25) New research is accumulating to demonstrate that day care projects can provide programs highly beneficial to the social and intellectual functioning of children. (26) When programs are successfully integrated with, and followed up by, the public school system, the possibility of maintaining these advantages remains high.

It is also important to realize that the *place* where care is given is not the most significant dimension for a child. The issue is the *kind* of care given: how he is handled, what abilities are nurtured, what values are learned, and what attitudes toward people are acquired. The child can learn to trust or hate in a neighbor's apartment, in a commune, in an expensive nursery school, or in his own house. Parents have realized this, and their fear of exposing their children to destructive influences, along with a wide-spread misunderstanding of children's needs and their relationship to our particular nuclear family arrangement, have tied "women more tightly to their children than has been thought necessary since the invention of bottle feeding and baby carriages." (27)

Our traditional model of the biological mother as the sole and constant caretaker is, in fact, unusual. In most cultures and in most centuries, care has been divided among the mother, father, sisters, brothers, aunts, grandparents, cousins, and neighbors. Universal education for older children, the geographic mobility of families, and the social isolation of many people in the cities have drastically limited these resources for the American mother. As a result, we are now faced with the need for new options for child care. The "day care" option involves placing the child for a sub-

277

stantial part of his day in the care of a person who initially has no close social relationship with the family. Like the location of care, this may be of little importance by itself—it is the developmental concern of the care, whatever its source, which is the world of the child and which influences the future adult.

Day care is a powerful institution. Quality service geared to the needs and abilities of each child can be an enormously constructive influence. But a poorly funded program, where children are left with few challenging activities and have little relationship with or guidance from adults, can seriously jeopardize development. A day care program that ministers to a child from six months to six years of age has over 8,000 hours to teach him values, fears, beliefs, and behaviors. Therefore, the question of what kinds of people we want our children to become must guide our view of day care. Scientific knowledge can point to several possible dangers and can suggest principles for sound programs. But the program which best suits a particular child in a given community cannot be predicted in any precise way. After all formal standards and guidelines have been met, parents and organizations must still remain open and responsive to the needs of individual children.

Child care programs cannot hope to meet the needs of children unless they are responsive to parents' values and their understanding of their own children. Similarly, parents can learn a great deal about meeting the needs of their children by remaining open to new knowledge about child development. One of the socially beneficial aspects of a day care program is that it provides a forum for parents and staff to pursue jointly new understandings to guide child-rearing endeavors.

Day Care, Politics, and Reality

A third factor behind the concern with day care is pragmatic. A growing number of mothers want to work and will seek the benefits of good care for their children and for themselves. In addition, such programs as Head Start have made the public aware of the vast potentials which can be realized if we commit ourselves and our country to providing a sufficient number of quality programs which encourage a new vigor for life in children, families, and communities.

Given a taste of such programs, the public is becoming anxious for continuation and expansion. To discuss at length whether day care is an economic luxury, a political right, or a social tool ignores the tremendous need for supplementary care which exists today, a need which parents will continue to meet the best they can with whatever resources are available. *The question is not whether America "should" have day care, but rather whether the day care which we do have, and will have, will be good—good for the child, good for the family, and good for the nation.*

As with any question of economic and social resources, people with the least private access to them deserve primary consideration in the allocation of public resources. Good developmental child care can cost $2,000 to $5,000 per year, and even most middle-class families cannot bear such costs.(28) Sliding scales for payment —from 0 to 100 percent—must be developed to enable all citizens to participate as we build toward a system of developmental child care available to all parents who seek it and all children who need it.

278

The ability to pay for care, though, is not the same issue as the need to find care. There are many segments of society which need

supplementary developmental child care. Employment rates are higher for mothers who are the sole support of their children, and higher for those whose husbands earn less than $3,000 a year; but most working mothers have working husbands earning more than $5,000 a year. The most rapid rise in seeking work and child care is occurring in the group of mothers with the most education. (29) The problem facing our public and private institutions is to organize and pay for good services for all families.

The Challenge

There are two clear issues in developmental child care for American children: the comprehensiveness and quality of care which all children deserve; and the responsiveness and flexibility of social institutions to the changing needs and desires of American parents. The best care, with stimulating and nurturing personnel, will be wasted if offered in programs which will not be used by families as they adjust their own social, economic, and personal needs. Simply keeping the child during parents' working hours without applying our utmost expertise and common sense for his sound development is as cruel and absurd as feeding him only minimal nutrition required to sustain life and expecting a vigorous and healthy body. We need not just day care centers so mothers can work, nor just preschools. Rather, we must respond as a nation to the changes that we as individuals are living, changes in our views of family roles and in the needs of our families with children. Our lives are changing more rapidly than our institutions. We must develop a network of voluntary supplementary child care, flexible enough to be part of family life, able to promote the full development of our children, and readily available to all families with children. We must commit our heads, our hearts, and our pocketbooks to this task.

Planning Supplementary Child Care Services

Forum 17 believes that the following points should be carefully considered in planning developmental child care services. (30)

Settings and Facilities

Although the location of child care is not a crucial factor, different settings can influence how well a particular service fits the needs of a family. For example, a center for children of two to six years adjacent to a factory may be useful in some circumstances. But problems will arise if the mother of a three-year-old also has an infant or a school-age child who will need some other care; or if the mother changes jobs and the child is no longer eligible for that center; or if difficult public transportation must be used. For a mother who works short hours, the family day care home run by a neighbor or a home-visiting service operating out of a child care center may be most useful. Families which must move frequently —migrant and seasonal workers, military personnel, and so on—face additional problems. Special settings may also be needed for evening care for children whose parents work unusual hours; or for short-term, crisis care in the case of death, illness, or arrest of a parent.

It is important that facilities "feel comfortable" to the children they serve. Ramps and other aspects of design may appreciably improve the handicapped child's view of his importance and belonging in the center. For normal children, too, one goal of design should be to foster their development; there is much room for innovation here. Facilities also have a role in the community; store-front, split-level modern, or whatever, a child care center should fit its community's view of what is appropriate and important.

The lack of funds for renovating and constructing facilities has inhibited the growth of more and innovative services. If a program must be revised to accommodate limitations of the available settings, crucial program elements for the child or the family may be slighted or eliminated. Every effort, therefore, must be made to provide facilities and settings for the services which encourage program flexibility and quality and are most appropriate to a given set of needs.

Personnel

There are not enough trained day care personnel to staff current programs, and expanding the services will increase this shortage. If half the four- and five-year-old children of working mothers were served by programs following the Federal Interagency Standards ratio of one adult to five children, over 35,000 trained personnel would be needed to staff those programs alone.

Recent attempts to define the skills needed by these workers have stressed general human abilities and sympathies, and specific training in child development, family relations, and community involvement. The need for persons with a variety of expertise suggests that active cooperation between educational institutions, local businesses, and individuals in the community can be very profitable. Academic training is by no means necessary for all persons who work with young children, but experience and training are essential for directors and head teachers if children are to receive quality care. In-service training of local persons has proven a valuable procedure for many day care programs, serving the joint purpose of producing excellent staff who know the life situation of the children and of using resources efficiently. Local colleges often help with planning and running the training programs and provide academic credit for those interested and able to develop careers in the field. Such career ladders are an important part of training programs. New roles are also needed for workers, both in terms of the duties they perform and the persons who fill them. Some programs are now being developed for personnel to administer basic health services and other program elements. Teenagers and older citizens, both male and female, can also work in programs to the benefit of both themselves and the children.

Programs

In the end, the content of a child care program is most important to the development of the child. Children need to learn social and intellectual attitudes and skills that will enable them to cope successfully with society and meet their own individual needs. A good program, then, must attend to all areas of growth: social, physical, emotional, intellectual, and spiritual. How these elements are combined in the program will depend heavily on such factors as the type of service and the other developmental resources of the community. Several points stand out, however, as especially important.

A good program must focus on the development of warm, trusting, and mutually respectful social relationships with adults and other children. Such relationships form the basis not only for the social and personal development of the child, but also for his future ability to learn from others.

The program must help develop self-identity so that each child views himself and his background as worthy of respect and dignity. A child's image of himself as a member of a racial, cultural, linguistic, religious, or economic group is basic to a strong self-concept. Cultural relevance, therefore, is not a separate political issue but an integral part of human development. Supple-

67-582 O - 71 - 12

mentary child care must not alienate a child from his family and his peers. Those in charge of programs must be knowledgeable of and sensitive to the values and patterns of life in the children's homes. To help correct past inadequacies and injustices and move toward a truly human heritage for future generations, children must also learn about our diverse cultures and their contributions to modern America.

Provisions must be made to ensure nutrition and health care that focus on promotion of optimal health and prevention of disease, as well as the identification, evaluation, and treatment of existing health problems. Integration of health services with other child care services is essential.

Attention must be given to the full development of each child, taking into account his or her individual ability, personality, imagination, and independence, and resisting the degradation caused by racist, sexist, economic, cultural, and other stereotypes.

A good program should utilize the knowledge and resources of those trained in, and familiar with, child development to foster the maximum potential of each child as well as to utilize their knowledge for selection and use of equipment, space, and methods to achieve the desired goals in a comprehensive child care program.

The inclusion of parents in the affairs of the program is a vital element in the value of the program.(31) It is important that families maintain the feeling of responsibility for, and involvement with, their children. Parental participation can be at several levels, depending on the particular family's skills and available time. The aim is mutually beneficial communication between the program and the parents. Parental control of fundamental aspects of the program is also important; this is one reason informal and private arrangements are preferred by many parents.

In institutionalized group care facilities, especially when supported by public funds, legal issues may become complicated, but they nevertheless remain secondary to the principle that child care centers, like governments, are instituted to serve the people. The power of control, therefore, should ultimately rest with those affected by the programs. Children, whose lives are the most affected, cannot vote for either policy-making bodies or public officials, but they must not be forgotten. One concern of day care as an institution should be to act as a voice for children.

Licensing

The licensing of out-of-home care for children can serve the dual purposes of protecting children and their families from inadequate care and of helping agencies and individuals improve their programs through providing, promoting, or coordinating training for staff in administration, program planning, and daily interaction and understanding of children. Unfortunately, many licensing authorities do not live up to these possibilities because regulations are inappropriate or because their own training and funding are inadequate. In some cases, the complexity of local, state, and other requirements impedes the establishment and expansion of programs, both good and bad. Too often, regulations focus on physical facilities and on superficial differences in services, such as "nursery schools" versus "day care centers," and ignore crucial areas such as the inclusion of specific program elements. The creation of licensing agencies with the resources and power to take strong action against harmful programs and equally strong

action for better care is one of the most important challenges in working for a flexible network of quality child care services.

Organization for the Delivery of Services

The need for coordination in the delivery of services arises in every discussion of day care needs. We see the goals as coordination and consolidation at upper levels, with coordination, diversity, and flexibility at local levels.

Although the Federal government is making efforts at coordinated planning through such actions as the Community Coordinated Child Care Program (4-C), designed by the Federal Panel on Early Childhood, it is currently operating over 60 different funding programs for child care or child development. Among these, there are at least seven separate programs with funds for operating expenses, nine personnel training programs, seven research programs, four food programs, and three loan programs. Only a few of these, however, are aimed directly at child development; most were set up for other purposes and day care or child development is only ancillary. Funding, moreover, is grossly inadequate, and state and local support is, with rare exceptions, minimal or non-existent.

As a result of such overlap, child care centers funded by different sources could compete for the same children. In other cases, proposed and needed centers cannot get funded. Lack of coordination may mean frequent placement changes for children. And, ironically, the complexity of sources can result in sorely needed funds remaining unknown and unused.

One solution to this set of problems would be to establish a Federal mechanism for consolidation, and local structures for coordination and diversity.

At the Federal level, consolidation of administrative responsibility for children's programs is urgently needed. The present administration has taken a significant step in establishing the Office of Child Development (OCD) and assigning to it responsibility for day care services. However, the responsibilities have not yet been designated for all programs concerned with early childhood development. Thus, Head Start and other programs could remain within OCD, while day care services delivered as part of the Family Assistance Plan could operate quite separately. This arrangement would violate both the ethical and scientific arguments against segregating children on the basis of financial need. Furthermore, health, educational, psychological, and social services are all part of the many-faceted approach which early childhood programs should include. Developmental day care services should be consolidated in one arm of the Federal Government, charged with general responsibility for all aspects of child development. Child development programs should focus on the child, not on his parents' status or on a bureaucratic division.

At the state and local level, maximum flexibility is needed and is compatible with a democratic form of government. To provide for diversity of programming and sponsorships which can best meet the needs of each community, parent, and child, a mechanism should be established to coordinate the several branches of government involved in the provision of day care services; non-public agencies, involved either directly or indirectly; and a substantial number of parents. Such a coordinative arrangement would serve to share knowledge of funding sources, to process information on the establishment and operation of programs, and to centralize

such resources as training and purchasing. A community-wide planning process would determine the priorities of need and funding which would ensure both the continuity of services and the generation of new programs.

The need for supplementary child care services is so great that only by cooperation of all parties can it be met. Estimates of the cost for the immediate unmet needs are on the order of two to four billion dollars a year. Only the Federal Government can mobilize such funds on a coordinated basis; but other sources, public and private, will also be vitally needed for the foreseeable future. Industry, business, and the university can be especially helpful by contributing expertise in organization, accounting, training, and other areas to local and state planning groups. They may also play a special role by supplying starting funds and some operating expenses to community child care services in return for a guaranteed number of places for the children of their employees.

Recommendation
Action for Developmental Child Care Services

We recommend that a diverse national network of comprehensive developmental child care services be established to accommodate approximately 5.6 million children by 1980 through consolidated Federal efforts via legislation and funding, as well as through coordinated planning and operation involving state, local, and private efforts.

The network's ultimate goal is to make high quality care available to all families who seek it and all children who need it. By 1980 it should be prepared to accommodate approximately 5.6 million of the estimated 17 million children potentially requiring developmental day care services, at a yearly cost of approximately $10 billion. Immediate efforts should be made to accommodate at least 500,000 children in each age group (infants, preschool, and school-age). These efforts will require $2 to $2.5 billion of Federal money per year, assuming that this amount can be matched from non-Federal sources, local, state, and private.

Such a network must be comprehensive in services, including at least educational, psychological, health, nutritional, and social services; and the services must support family life by ensuring parent participation and involvement as well as including a cooperative parent education program.

The network must offer a variety of services including, where appropriate, group day care, family care, and home care, as well as evening and emergency care. Services must cover all age groups from infants through elementary school age.

Local coordination of child care services through a Neighborhood Family and Child Center should be strongly considered wherever appropriate. The Center would:

Offer all the comprehensive and supplementary services outlined above.

Serve as an outlet for other programs and services and as a meeting place for parent and youth groups so that it may help create a community without alienation and separation.

Existing comprehensive Federal legislation must not only provide funds adequate for operating programs (up to 100 percent where necessary) at the levels projected above, but legislation must also

Establish child care services independently of public welfare, ensuring integration of services to all ethnic and socioeconomic groups

Include funds for planning, support services, training and technical assistance; facility construction and renovation; coordination of programs at Federal, state, and local levels; research and development; and evaluation and monitoring

Ensure program continuity through long-term grants and contracts.

The need for private capital in efforts to develop the system is recognized. This Forum approves this involvement only if quality is maintained in all areas affecting the child and/or his family. The use of private funds should be encouraged by: legislation to provide low-cost loans for facility construction and renovation; tax incentives to the private sector to develop quality child care services; and alteration of tax schedules to provide tax relief to families who have children in developmental care.

While working toward the above goal, first priority for spaces should go to children and families in greatest need, whether the need be economic, physical, emotional, or social. One hundred percent funding should be made available for those who cannot afford quality child care; a sliding scale should also be available to those above the poverty level who are unable to bear full cost of the same developmental opportunities as those given children who must be fully subsidized by public funding.

Coordination of services should be ensured through consolidation of all Federal activities relating to child development in the Office of Child Development, and by coordination and planning by state and local bodies. When a state's efforts are unable to meet the needs of its children, direct Federal funding to local projects should be required.

To hasten the achievement of this network, all construction of housing, business, industry, and service facilities (such as hospitals) which receive Federal funds should be required to provide developmental child care services, either by including such services in the construction or ensuring permanent funds for participation in existing or planned facilities.

All child care centers and services should abide by local, state, and Federal laws that apply to non-discrimination in programming, housing, and construction of new buildings. Day care centers should make every effort to support businesses that have non-discriminatory practices.

Ensure Quality of Child Care Services

We recommend that the quality of child care services in America be ensured through innovative and comprehensive training of child care personnel in adequate numbers; parent and community control of services; and supportive monitoring of services and programs with enforcement of appropriate standards.

To ensure adequate personnel:

The Federal government should fund and coordinate a combined effort by all levels of government, educational institutions, the private sector, and existing child care organizations to train at least 50,000 additional child care workers annually over the next decade.

Education should be provided for training staff, professionals, preprofessionals, and volunteer staff who work directly with children; administrative and ancillary staff of child care programs; and parents.

Special training for parenthood should be instituted in all public school systems, starting before junior high school. It should provide direct experience in child care centers and should include both male and female students.

Joint efforts by educational institutions and existing child care services should be directed at creating new types of child care workers for child care settings. These new positions could be in areas such as health, child development, education, evaluation, and community services.

Educational institutions should ensure transferability of training credits in child care; issue certificates of training which are nationally recognized; and establish a consistent system of academic credit for direct work experience.

Child care institutions should allow paid periods for continuing training and career development. Funding for this policy should be required in all Federal grants for child care service operations.

To ensure that the system is responsive to demands for quality care:

Parents of enrolled children must control the program at least by having the power to hire and fire the director and by being consulted on other positions.

Parent and local communities must also control local distribution of funds and community planning and coordination.

To ensure the continuing quality of child care:

Standards for service facilities and program elements must apply to all child care services, regardless of funding or auspices.

Standards must be appropriate to the cultural and geographic areas, the types of care, and the available resources.

Parents and other community members must play a role in the flexible administration of standards, licensing, and monitoring.

Licensing should allow for some provisional status while the service is being built up, to enable programs to receive full funding.

Federal and/or state governments should provide funds for training monitoring personnel. These personnel must be numerous enough both to observe the services in their area and to work for their improvement.

National Public Education Campaign

We recommend a national campaign, coordinated and funded by a Federal task force, to broaden public understanding of child care needs and services.

The campaign should be directed by a task force of citizens representing the breadth of economic and cultural groups in America who are concerned with the issues of developmental child care services.

285

Using Federal monies, the task force should contract with several private, non-profit organizations (such as the Day Care and Child Development Council of America, the Black Child Development Institute, the Child Welfare League of America, and the National Association for the Education of Young Children) to prepare and disseminate to the general public and specific institutions information concerning the difficulties, values, needs, costs, and technicalities of child care services. Consumer education for informed selection of child care services should be a major element of the campaign. The campaign should use all forms of media.

The task force should prepare and make public an annual report evaluating its activities and contracts. A cumulative report should be presented to the 1980 White House Conference on Children.

The task force should operate through the Office of Child Development and should feed back to that office any information it receives concerning the public's need for developmental child care services.

The Federal government should additionally contribute to public awareness by providing child care facilities at all Federally sponsored conferences and conventions, including the 1980 White House Conference on Children.

The task force should encourage business and industry to make it easier to be both an employee and a good parent. For example, job hours should be flexible wherever possible, and more part-time jobs, for both male and female, should be made available with prestige and security equal to full-time jobs.

Resolutions by Forum 17 Delegates

We hereby change the title of Forum 17 from "Developmental Day Care Services for Children" to "Developmental Child Care Services." (The title of Forum 17 was changed by unanimous vote in order to stress that the needs of children and families with which we are concerned are not restricted to daytime hours, and that child care must always be developmental, not simply custodial. The content of the paper should make it clear that we are not discussing "child care services" in the sense of adoption, foster homes, or institutional care.)

We, the Developmental Child Care Forum of the 1970 White House Conference on Children, find the Federal Child Care Corporation Act, S. 4101, inadequate and urge its defeat.

S. 4101 (Senator Long's Bill) does not address the basic problem of providing operating funds. Nor does it provide an acceptable delivery system which must place the decision-making authority at the local level and given parents a decisive role in the policy direction of those programs in which their children participate.

As a matter of principle, we do not believe that program standards should ever be written into law. S. 4101 would not only fix standards in law, but would provide for such minimal standards that it would allow the widespread public funding of custodial programs which we vigorously oppose.

Society has the ultimate responsibility for the well-being and optimum development of all children. The implementation of this responsibility requires that child development services such as day care, Head Start, and after-school programs, be available in all the variety of forms to meet the needs of all children whose parents or guardians request, or whose circumstances require, such services. In further implementation of this concept, we propose that all child development services be completely separated from public

assistance programs. They must not be developed to lessen public assistance roles but rather as a basic right.

We applaud the President's stated commitment to the healthy development of young children. We believe that the creation of the Office of Child Development has been an important first step in fulfilling this commitment but further steps have not been evident.

We strongly recommend that the administration now act to provide the necessary resources to implement this commitment. The Office of Child Development must be enabled to meet its appropriate responsibilities, including action on the recommendations of the White House Conference.

We support the plan for a children's lobby presented by J. Sugarman, as amended.

We support the recommendations of the Spanish-speaking, Spanish-surname caucus, especially those most relevant to Forum 17 and as amended by it; to wit:

To ensure that the specific concerns of the Spanish-speaking children of the nation not be neglected and that the issues pertinent to groups such as Spanish-speaking American Indians and Black Americans not be diffused, the Spanish-speaking Caucus makes the following recommendations.	Para asegurar que los intereses de los niños de habla-Hispana de la nación no sean despreciados y que los puntos importantes a este grupo no sean olvidados el caucus de personas de habla Española y de nombres Hispanos sugiere las siguientes recomendaciones.
Multilingual, multicultural education must be provided in the schools, on radio, and television, wherever five percent of the child population is of more than one culture.	El sistema educacional del país, así como las radio difusoras, televisión y todo medio de comunicación tiene que levar a cabo programas multilinguales multiculturales dondequiera que el 5% de la población de niños representa mas de una cultura.
Among the most disadvantaged children in the United States are the children of Spanish-speaking and Spanish-surname migrant workers. The highest priorities must be placed on immediate implementation of an extensive and comprehensive program to deal with the health, education, welfare, and labor problems faced by these children and their parents.	Entre los niños de mayores necesidades básicas de los Estados Unidos se encuentran los niños de habla y tradición Hispana, que son hijos de trabajadores de labor en agricultura (migratorio y temporal). Debe prestarse altas prioridades a un programa extenso y comprehensivo de ayudar a resolver los problemas de salud, educación, asistencia social, y trabajo que enfrentan estos niños y sus familias.
The child care and child development programs must be controlled at the community and neighborhood level by the parents of the children served so as to ensure the child an environment akin to his cultural	La dirección de todo programa—sea para el desarrollo del niño o cuidar el niño—tiene que estar en las manos de los padres de los niños en el programa. De este modo los padres de familia como representantes de la

and ethnic heritage. Services must be divorced from welfare agencies and must not be used to force or entice mothers to work if they prefer to care for their own children.

comunidad y los barrios mantienen el control y aseguran que el ambiente del programa refleja y respeta la cultura, el idioma y las costumbres del niño. Servicios tendran que ser separados de agencias de Bienestar Público y asegurar que madres que prefieren cuidar sus hijos no serán obligadas de trabajar.

Through parliamentary error, the statement on child care by the Black Caucus was not brought to the floor for a vote by the delegates. It read:

We strongly urge that Federal funding be available for day care centers for all children. Such programs should be planned and directed by the people of the community who use them and that this funding not be through state or local welfare agencies. All efforts to commercialize day care centers should be resisted.

The Forum members support the thrust of this statement.

The statements by the Women's Caucus, and other groups and Forums, supporting universally available developmental child care are also appreciated. The full texts of these statements were not available for detailed consideration by the Forum members at their final meeting.

Special Resolutions by Forum 17 Members

Forum 17 supported the convening of a plenary session to deal with the following conflicts on a conference-wide basis: direct delegate input to the Conference; racism; and neglect of chairmen and vice chairmen in the initial planning of the Conference.

The Forum panel also feels strongly that there has been no convincing commitment of Conference officials or the Federal administration to sincerely act to implement the recommendations of the Conference. We urge the Forum chairmen, vice chairmen, and representatives of the conference caucuses to remain an independent, self-constituted body to continue to report to the delegates of the White House Conference and to the public on the efforts or lack of efforts taken at the national level to implement the Forum's recommendations.

References

1. Beatrice Rosenberg and Pearl G. Spindler, *Day Care Facts*, United States Department of Labor. Women's Bureau, Publication WB–70–213, May 1970, p. 1.

2. United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. As presented in *Profiles of Children*, 1970 White House Conference on Children.

3. Mary Dublin Keyserling, *Working Mothers and the Need for Child Care Services*, United States Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, June 1968, pp. 6–7.

4. Seth Low and Pearl G. Spindler, *Child Care Arrangements of Working Mothers in the United States*, Children's Bureau Publication No. 461–1968, pp. 8–10.

5. See, for example, *Child Care Services Provided by Hospitals*, United States Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, Bulletin 295–1970, p. 20.

6. Low and Spindler, *op. cit.*, pp. 15–18.

7. Sixteen percent of all three- and four-year-olds in the United States or 1.2 million children, now attend some form of educational nursery school, up from 9.6 percent in 1964. The increase is apparently largely the result of the Head Start Program. Data from the Census Bureau as reported in the *New York Times*, 11 October 1970, p. 8.

8. Mary Dublin Keyserling, *The Magnitude of Day Care Needs Today*. An address delivered to Forum 17 of the 1970 White House Conference on Children, 14 December 1970. Reporting on preliminary results of "Windows on Day Care," report in preparation by the National Council of Jewish Women. Rosenberg and Spindler, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

9. Milton Willner, *The Magnitude and Scope of Family Day Care in New York City*, final report of Grant R120 from the Children's Bureau, 1966.

10. *Mental Health Services for Children*, prepared by the Center for Studies of Child and Family Mental Health, National Institute of Mental Health; Public Health Service publication 1844, October 1968.

11. *Crisis in Child Mental Health: Challenge for the 1970's*, Report of the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), p. 38.

12. President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, and National Institute of Child Health and Development. As presented in *Profiles of Children*, 1970 White House Conference on Children.

13. *Crisis in Mental Health*, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 62.

15. Rosenberg and Spindler, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

16. Keyserling, 1970, *op. cit.*

17. Florence A. Ruderman, "Conceptualizing Needs for Day Care," in *Day Care: An Expanding Resource for Children* (New York Child Welfare League of America, 1965), pp. 14–27.

18. Florence A. Ruderman, *Child Care and Working Mothers: A Study of Arrangements Made for Daytime Care of Children* (New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1968), pp. 88, 338–58.

19. Lois M. Stolz, "Effects of Maternal Employment in Children: Evidence of Research," *Child Development* 37 (1960): pp. 749–82. See also F. I. Nye and Hoffman, *The Employed Mother in America* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963).

20. Arthur C. Emlen, *Realistic Planning for the Day Care Consumer*, mimeograph, 1970.

21. J. McV. Hunt, *Intelligence and Experience* (New York: Ronald, 1961); Benjamin S. Bloom, *Stability and Change in*

Human Characteristics (New York: Wiley, 1964); Henry W. Maier, *Three Theories of Child Development: The Contributions of Erik H. Erikson, Jean Piaget, and Robert Sears, and their Applications* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965).

22. *PCMR* Message. "The Retarded Victims of Deprivation," an address by Whitney M. Young, Jr., Executive Director, National Urban League, to the 18th Annual Convention of the National Association for Retarded Children, Portland, Oregon, 19 October 1967 (Washington, D.C.: The President's Committee on Mental Retardation, January 1968).

23. Milton Willner, "Day Care; a Reassessment," *Child Welfare* 44 (1965): pp. 125–133; World Health Organization, *Deprivation of Maternal Care: A Reassessment of its Effects* (Geneva: WHO).

24. Bettye M. Caldwell and Lucille E. Smith, "Day Care for the Very Young—Prime Opportunity for Primary Prevention," *American Journal of Public Health* 60 (1970): pp. 690–97; Bettye M. Caldwell, Charlene M. Wright, Alice S. Honig, and Jordan Tannenbaum. "Infant Day Care and Attachment," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 40 (1970): 397–412.

25. See, for example, Joan W. Swift, "Effects of Early Group Experience: The Nursery School and Day Nursery." in *Review of Child Development Research*, ed. M. L. Hoffman and L. W. Hoffman (New York: Russell Sage, 1964), 1: pp. 249–89.

26. Bettye M. Caldwell, "The Supportive Environment Model of Early Enrichment," paper presented at annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Miami, Florida, September 1970; E. S. Schaefer, "Home Tutoring, Maternal Behavior and Infant Intellectual Development," paper presented at the American Psychological Association Meeting, Washington, D. C., September 1969; P. Levenstein, "Cognitive Growth in Preschoolers through Verbal Interaction with Mothers," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 40 (1970): pp. 426–32; Laura L. Dittman, ed., *Early Child Care: The New Perspectives* (New York: Atherton, 1968).

27. Margaret Mead, "Some Theoretical Considerations on the Problem of Mother-child Separation," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 24 (1954): pp. 477.

28. Estimates of cost of care vary widely, depending on the region of the country, age of the child, and type of care. The Office of Child Development has estimated for preschoolers that full day center care ranges from $1245 to $2320 per child per year; for home day care from $1423 to $2372; for before and after school and summer care from $310 to $653. (*Standards and Costs for Day Care*, mimeograph of Office of Child Development, prepared by J. Sugarman, *et al.*) Additional breakdowns are given by R. Parker and J. Knitzer, *Background Paper on Day Care and Preschool Services: Trends in the Nineteen Sixties and Issues for the Nineteen Seventies*, prepared on behalf of the Office of Child Development for 1970 White House Conference on Children.

29. *Who are the Working Mothers?* Leaflet 37 (rev.), United States Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, May 1970.

30. For practical information on planning and operating developmental child care services, see the publications of the Child

Development Day Care Resources Projects, jointly sponsored by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Child Development; the Office of Economic Opportunity; and the Panel on Education Research and Development of the President's Science Advisory Committee. Ronald K. Parker, Project Director.

31. A. B. Willmon, "Parent Participation as a Factor in the Effectiveness of Head Start Programs," *Journal of Educational Research* 62 (1969): 406–10.

32. Special thanks are due to the Forum 17 task force on training and licensing, chaired by June Sale, for many of the ideas on these topics. Their full report will be made available at a later date.

33. Special thanks are due to the Forum 17 task force on delivery of services, chaired by Dr. Alfred Kahn, for many of the ideas on this topic. Their full report will be available at a later date. The address of Wilbur Cohen to the Forum was also helpful in revising this and other sections.

Forum No. 17 Members

Jerome Kagan (Chairman)

Therese Lansburgh (Vice Chairman)

Arnita Boswell

Bettye Caldwell

Luis Diaz De Leon

Donald Fink

Edith Finlayson

Almavina Garcia

Kino Gonzales

Oddie Hoover

Ruth E. Jefferson

Hope Lugo

Mary Robinson

Evelyn K. Moore

Jule Sugarman

Pauline Barton

Clara Godbouldt

ed

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN
REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT
(Selected Excerpts)

Report of Forum 23
Alternatives to Delinquency, Abuse and Neglect

Day Care Centers	We recommend that proper day care centers be established throughout the country for all children who need them. We also suggest that older children and stable senior citizens, who perhaps now occupy other institutions, be trained to act as paraprofessionals to assist in these centers.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN
REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT
(Selected Excerpts)

Report of Forum 24
The Child Advocate

Children's Rights

The Declaration of Independence states:

We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

This Forum asserts its complete accord with this proposition and its belief that such rights inure to *all* persons, including children. Other basic rights and needs are unique to children including parental care, a secure home, proper nutrition, mental and physical health, moral guidance, reasonable limits on conduct, and education and training commensurate with natural talents and ability. Government should be responsive to these legitimate and particular needs. Equally important, children should be helped to recognize and assume responsibilities commensurate with their age and maturity.

The Case for a System of Child Advocacy

A substantial segment of children exists whose basic needs are only partially met or totally ignored; and the effect of such neglect is obvious. Unemployment among school dropouts is nearly four times that of others in the employment market. The spiraling increase in delinquency and youth crime is documented in the tabloids daily. Children from poor and lower income families, especially minority groups in ghetto areas and children of migratory workers, seldom achieve full potential because of cultural and environmental handicaps. Children with mental and physical disabilities also fall short of their full potential because of inadequate, or lack of, health services. Permissiveness and affluence have produced a significant force of dissident youth whose conduct ranges from harmless idleness to gross drug abuse and violent disruption.

While many factors contribute to the plight of such children and youth, certainly one significant cause is the absence of a system responsible for securing the basic rights guaranteed them under our Constitution. These children need an advocate.

Some child advocacy now exists such as representation by lawyers in juvenile and family court proceedings and in some other legal, or quasi-legal, areas; the services of a school social worker or counselor; and the protective services of a child welfare worker to an abused or neglected child. Some organizations broadly represent child interests by fostering improved child care programs, increased health service, better schools, and needed protective legislation, and some by instituting legal class actions to improve the lot of whole segments of children.

While these services for children are both useful and necessary, they do not meet the day-to-day wants of the individual child in his own environment, nor are they designed to do so. Both public and private agencies whose charge is to furnish health, education, and welfare services to children, often stray from their purpose or fall far short of their goals.

The notorious inadequacy of services to children is due to more than a shortage of professional staff. Child-serving agencies in the private domain perform at less than optimal effectiveness because of several biases which have emerged in their development.

First, agencies emphasize program descriptions more than im-

plementation and evaluation. The search for status, prestige, and empire-building by following the latest fad or catchword in professional circles leads to many "paper programs." Secondly, agencies tend to be dominated by one particular profession or guild whose concerns are less child-oriented than territorially dominated. Too many programs are written to expand a guild's territory rather than to give relevant and needed services. Thirdly, agencies use their expertise in diagnosis and classification of children as a means of excluding children from services. Rigid definitions of who can be treated often exclude children who need the service the most or send them on endless rounds of diagnosis in lieu of giving help.

Agencies in the public domain suffer from their own brand of "governmental ills." Bureaucratic and inflexible sets of eligibility requirements both alienate many clients and exclude them on the basis of arbitrary funding or logistical concerns. The needs of those unrecognized by specific legislation, those who fall between the cracks, must wait until a suitable category is created.

Common to almost all agencies is a lack of accountability to those they serve. The philosophy of the "white man's burden" or a sort of professional *noblesse oblige* still permeates the system. The client is usually the last consulted concerning his own future.

Every child, because of his immaturity and legal disabilities, requires a skilled, experienced, and dedicated advocate whenever he is deprived of a home, schooling, medical care, property rights, entitlements or benefits. This Forum believes independent representation for children, a system of child advocacy, is urgently needed and should be immediately created.

Goals and Objectives of the Child Advocate System

The broad goals of a system of child advocacy include:

Ensuring that each child is reared in an environment which secures his fundamental rights and allows the development of his fullest potential

Strengthening the family by bringing together the community's helping services, public and private, secular and religious, with a united attack on areas of special concern

Improving and strengthening established child and family care agencies and extending these services into the community

Providing basic services where they do not exist until a permanent agency can be brought in or created

Working for legislative, judicial, and administrative change to permanently improve the lot of children.

Structure

In considering how an advocacy system might be implemented, the Forum discussed existing government departments, agencies, and bureaus to consider the advantages and disadvantages of their different plans and structures. Forum delegates and consultants, presently or previously employed in such agencies at a national level, offered extensive comment and advice on the subject. The overriding recommendation of nearly every Forum participant was to describe a structure which would preserve the integrity and independence of the advocacy system and create a highly visible and accessible child advocate to work directly with children and families.

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

serve children; to work for improvement and to expose those areas where they are inadequate or ineffective (such as lack of protective services, dilatory or unrealistic adoptive procedures, or poor foster home care).

It should be stressed, the Advocate does not duplicate or supplant existing services. For example, he is not a lawyer to displace the public defender, court-appointed counsel, or the parent-selected attorney in juvenile court matters. Yet he may perform or secure such service where it is non-existent or ineffective. He does not invade the province of the legal aid or legal services attorney in legal representation of a child or family in public or private litigation. He may, however, provide or arrange for such service where it does not exist. He does not institute class litigation on behalf of children and families if legal services are available for this purpose, except where such service is unresponsive to his client's needs.

He does not assume the role of the teacher, school counselor, principal, or other school official in prescribing school programs or curricula. When the child fails to learn or when he is suspended or expelled, the Advocate may, in cooperation with a parent, negotiate with the school or take other appropriate action on behalf of his client, the child.

He does not encroach upon the domain of the physician, other health specialists, or child guidance counseling services, but he ensures that these services are provided to the child.

He does not interfere in legitimate parent-child relations, but he may secure help for the family and child. Where persistent abuse or neglect occurs, he may obtain protective services or refer the case for court intervention.

He does not try to replace or duplicate the efforts of public or private child care agencies, although he will negotiate with the agency on behalf of an individual child who cannot obtain needed help. Through his local board, he may advocate changes in the nature and extent of care, or modification of rules and procedures which deny the child needed services.

He does not impede the lawful functions of the police in their dealings with child and family problems, but he will intercede with the police on behalf of individual children, to prevent unnecessary detention or to avoid court referral where possible. To foster better police-child-family relations and to preserve human dignity and promote respect for law, he will seek to improve police juvenile services and resources available to them through recommendations to the local board.

In summary, the Child Advocate will be a spokesman for individual children who do not have a concerned parent who speaks for them or who can secure needed services. He secures for children, individually and as a group, their basic rights and needs, including those related to the home, school, peer group, association, and community institutions which in some way affect their lives. Through the local board, the Advocate is concerned about improving the quality of service to children.

The Advocate and His Staff

We conceive of the Child Advocate as a full-time, salaried individual responsible for children in a designated geographic area. He is foremost an empathetic child-oriented person; his profes-

sional qualifications are less important than a practical understanding of his community and an ability to convey to the local board the need for bettering or creating services for children. Just as a good parent is not professionally and technically qualified to meet all his children's needs, but knows where and how to secure help, so the Advocate would perform such functions. The Child Advocate is not an authoritarian figure. Rather, he will use his knowledge and skills to bring together the child in need and the needed service.

When a child-serving agency is unresponsive to the Advocate's efforts, the problem will be referred to the local Advocacy Board, which should be able to persuade the agency to improve its service. If the agency does not respond or requires additional funds to act, the Advocacy Board's responsibility will be to marshal public opinion to bring about change. Through funds available to the local Child Advocacy Board, temporary services may also be purchased when needed. By demonstrating the needs for locally unavailable assistance, as well as the benefits to the community, the Board may create a demand which will result in the establishment and funding of additional service.

Should class litigation, actions for declaratory judgments, or similar suits be necessary to reform existing agency practices, the Board will have both funds and authority to bring such action.

Finally, through a network of child advocacy, any local deficiencies or abuses of Federally funded child care programs will be reported so that such problems can be corrected at the Federal level.

Specific Areas of Advocacy

The Family

Because day-to-day advocacy for children should come from the parents, one of the advocacy program's foremost concerns will be to strengthen and preserve the family by dealing with the many institutions and multiple community problems relative to them. These include housing, environment (eradication of slum and ghetto conditions), improved child and family law (such as divorce, custody, children's laws on neglect, delinquency, and employment), child protective services, medical and dental care, mental health and counseling programs for families (marriage counseling, child guidance clinics), special services for the mentally and physically disabled, religious organizations and extension of their services to children, and better use of existing private institutions (boy and girl scouts, and private, charitable, and child-family agencies).

For those parents who cannot fully provide for their children or who do not know where or how to obtain needed services, the Child Advocate will be a source of help and support. For example, a child with serious learning or behavior problems may be mentally or physically handicapped. When parents cannot secure a satisfactory diagnosis or proper treatment, the Advocate will help them obtain an evaluation of the child's needs and see that these are met.

When the family endangers the child, as by willful neglect or abuse; where the family, for whatever reason (unemployment, illness, desertion, or separation), fails to provide proper care; and where existing community agencies do not intervene effectively, the Advocate should represent the child. The Advocate should not, however, interfere with acceptable parental prerogatives or dis-

cipline nor will he undermine the child's responsibilities towards his family.

The School

The school is second only to the parents in influencing a child's character and personality, in preparing him to live in and with his environment, and in determining what kind of an adolescent and adult he will become. Parents and community increasingly look to the school, particularly primary and elementary schools, as a major child-rearing and socializing agent. However, the school system fails some children because it ignores the child's home and out-of-school environment. There must be relevance between what is taught, how the child lives, and his projected way of life. When a system fails to accept and respond to this demand, widespread school-child-parent conflict results.

Because of the school's vital and continued influence on the child, a significant part of the Child Advocate's efforts will be devoted to child-school relations. A significant number of children are expelled, suspended, or otherwise excluded from school for reasons ranging from truancy, misconduct, child-teacher conflict, violation of rules, to poor peer-group relationships. One child may fail in school because of an unrecognized physical or mental handicap. Another may lag behind because he lacks basic skills in reading and expression. A third child may be the victim of a destructive home environment; a fourth may find no interest or relevance in the school curriculum, and a fifth may be alienated by a boring or insensitive teacher. All may manifest their anger or frustration by improper, disruptive conduct. Generally these actions are symptomatic of other problems. If the parent does not or cannot obtain reinstatement, the Child Advocate may intervene to learn the true reason for the child's difficulty and negotiate for corrective measures.

Many school suspensions and expulsions are obviously justified. Where the child is patently wrong, the Child Advocate's first efforts should be directed to obtaining the services necessary to modify the child's behavior and then trying to secure his admission. Obviously, mere reinstatement of such a child in no way ensures a future positive relationship between child and school. Unless the root cause is recognized and solved, the incident will probably recur. Since the school often has neither the time nor mechanism to seek out such causes, the Child Advocate will attempt to learn and alleviate the source of trouble by obtaining remedial medical care for the handicapped, special tutoring for the academically deficient, modification in home environment, a change of school, curriculum, or teacher, or whatever services are needed.

Of course, more superficial child-school conflicts can arise from dress codes and unpopular regulations and restrictions. Here the Advocate's role will be to seek not only the reinstatement of a suspended or expelled child, but also modification of unduly restrictive rules which could produce future child-school problems.

Since the Advocate's primary concern is for all children, he must work to help both individual children and to ensure that the school system is the most effective possible.

The Police

Children's attitudes toward law, law enforcement, and authority are formed early and once solidified, usually prevail unchanged in adult life. Because the child's perception of the police, an early symbol of authority, is most important, the Advocate has a special mission in fostering improved child-parent-police relationships.

394

Especially in urban areas, the police have a far broader role than merely keeping the peace and apprehending law violators. They are often the community's unseen and unsung first line of defense in meeting a wide variety of social, physical, and emotional problems of parents and children. It is the police who most often are the first to reach the child or parent in crisis. It is they who locate the lost or runaway child, who intervene on behalf of the abused and neglected child. They are called to arbitrate disruptive marital disputes and family quarrels, to deal with suicide and homicide threats and other forms of physical violence which erupt within a family, or to aid the alcoholic or mentally ill parent.

The Child Advocate will have a special need to understand and work with the police, since the police will turn to the Child Advocate to:

Refer a child or child-parent problem which cannot be handled through existing channels

Aid the parents on behalf of the children in a family in obtaining special services to relieve a known disruptive problem; for example, legal services for oppressive debt, medical help for alcoholism, marriage counseling for family problems, or vocational training for an underemployed family head

Obtain shelter, care, and protective services for any abused or neglected child when the usual child care services fail or are non-existent.

By working directly with both police and public education resources, the Advocate will also encourage employment of juvenile officers with appropriate temperament, attitude, and training. Equally important, the Advocate Board will strive to change those laws and police procedures based on obsolete concepts held by both police and the public regarding what constitutes effective child and juvenile police work.

The Court

Almost universally, the concept of juvenile justice is moving juvenile and family courts toward a program of court appointed counsel for children who come within the court's orbit. This change is more prevalent in charges of delinquency which may result in institutional commitment, than in less serious matters of truancy, runaways, and rejection of parental authority. In areas of neglect and abuse, custody disputes, and non-support, legal representation for children is still limited, and in many jurisdictions non-existent.

In the juvenile justice system, the Advocacy Board has a dual role:

Where legal representation of the child is not provided by parents or the court or where the service is inadequate, the Advocate should represent the child. If the Advocate is not a licensed attorney, his staff should include, or his board be empowered to engage, an attorney.

The Advocacy Board must be concerned with the entire process by which justice is administered to children, from intake and adjudication to disposition and aftercare. Specifically, the Board must focus on intake procedures, quality and objectivity of social reports, probation planning, the basis for institutional placement, the quality and extent of treatment in institutions, duration of stay, and provisions for release and aftercare.

395

The Advocacy Board will seek to improve and upgrade juvenile and family law; press for competent, specially trained judges; and advocate more and better trained court staff and community based treatment facilities.

Other Agencies

Most communities have at least some public and private child-serving agencies such as public welfare, church developed and supported agencies, day care centers, and health care facilities., The Advocacy Board should stimulate the discovery of programmatic alternatives for improved child care and urge the creation of more alternative "solutions" to child problems. The Advocacy Board can also devise a system whereby the agency will be *accountable to the client* or his surrogate, rather than to an external funding source, thus emphasizing the program rather than its description.

On a case level, the Child Advocate can ensure that agency decisions made about a child are subject to review at a local level. His prime role can be to ensure that several alternative paths are open to the child at each decision point within an agency, and that these alternatives and their possible outcomes are known to both child and/or surrogate and agency personnel.

Recommendations

Establish immediately a high level, independent Office of Child Advocacy with a network of local advocacy programs.

The cost of the Child Advocacy program will be paid from Federal tax monies, with provision for use of other supplemental funds without the requirement for matching funds.

States, local communities, and neighborhoods can develop their own programs. States which do not develop comprehensive plans, and hence do not develop state councils, would not receive Federal funds for state programs. The Federal law should provide that direct local or neighborhood grants for local planning can be made where no state council is developed or the National Office of Child Advocacy determines the state plan to be insufficient. Such direct local or neighborhood grants will not be subject to veto by state officials.

Local councils shall be structured to maintain effective citizen control while providing for active participation of community agencies and organizations concerned with the child.

Conclusion

This Forum believes there is a distinct and urgent need for a Department of Children and Youth and a Child Advocacy program. If properly conceived, explained, and implemented and if presented as helpful, rather than threatening, to existing institutions, it should be received enthusiastically.

Today the rights of a significant number of children are totally ignored. Neglect, poor parental supervision, inadequate schools, understaffed and insensitive systems of justice, and poor child nutrition and health care all contribute to the filling of our mental and penal institutions and the swelling of relief rolls. We will not reduce these increasing problems until we correct the sources.

By ensuring to children in their formative years their fundamental rights, we can achieve the basic values of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The advocacy program is not the sole answer, but it is one way to reach, influence, and protect children in a manner no institution now does. The alert, concerned, vigorous efforts of an independent advocate, responsive to children, can ensure that children's rights will be safeguarded and that they will enjoy their true heritage as free people.

Forum No. 24 Members

James Delaney (Chairman)

Angela B. Bartell (Vice Chairman)

Fred Arguello

Steve Bolliger

Flora M. Boyd

Harietta Deal

Lois G. Forer

Phyllis Lake

Daniel Perez

Samuel Sublett, Jr.

Michael Tracy

Edward Tuchek

Aidan Gough

Mary Rita Ostrander

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN
REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT
(Selected Excerpts)

Results of Balloting by the Delegates to the 1970 White House Conference on Children on Overriding Concerns and Specific Recommendations

Overriding Concerns

Following are the results of the December 18, 1970, balloting by the White House Conference on Children, as certified by the accounting firm of Alexander Grant & Company, Washington, D.C.

Votes were cast by 1,912 delegates, or 52% of those eligible. Several Forums chose not to vote, feeling that all of the recommendations should be considered of equal importance.

	Weighted Vote*	Ranked by No. of 1st Place Votes Only
Comprehensive family-oriented child development programs including health services, day care and early childhood education	1	3
The development of programs to eliminate the racism which cripples all children	2	2
Reordering of national priorities beginning with a guaranteed basic family income adequate for the needs of children	3	1
Improve nation's system of child justice so law responds in timely, positive ways to needs of children	4	11
A Federally financed national child health care program which assures comprehensive care for all children	5	6
A system of early identification of children with special needs and which delivers prompt and appropriate treatment	6	10
Establishment of a child advocacy agency financed by the Federal government and other sources with full ethnic, cultural, racial and sexual representation	7	8
Establish immediately a Cabinet post of children and youth to meet needs of all children	8	4
Health, welfare, education and bilingual-bicultural growth of all children must be given top priority	9	7
Immediate, massive funding for development of alternative optional forms of public education	10	9
A change in our national way of life to bring people back into the lives of children	11	5
Elimination of racism demands many meaningful Federal programs, particularly an adequate family income maintenance floor	12	12

*Under the weighted voting system, 1st place votes received 16 points, 2nd place votes 15 points, 3rd place 14 points and so on. Each concern's total points determined its rank in the listing.

	Weighted Vote*	Ranked by No. of 1st Place Votes Only
A national land use policy must be developed to guarantee the quality of leisure services, social services and our nation's natural resources for all children	13	15
Universal developmental child care without sex role stereotyping will help to eliminate institutional, individual sexism	14	16
All institutions and programs that affect children must involve children as active participants in the decision-making process	15	13
The Indian representatives of this Conference will recommend that all levels embark on a vigorous practical approach to enhance the future of our children	16	14

* Under the weighted voting system, 1st place votes received 16 points, 2nd place votes 15 points, 3rd place 14 points and so on. Each concern's total points determined its rank in the listing.

Recommendations
Specific Forum

	Rating	No. of Votes
Provide opportunities for every child to learn, grow, and live creatively by reordering national priorities	1	933
Redesign education to achieve individualized, humanized, child-centered learning. We support proposed National Institute of Education with this goal	2	820
Establishment of citizen community action groups to implement the multitude of excellent recommendations which have evolved out of this White House Conference on Children	3	771
Reform justice system; emphasize prevention and protection; replace large institutions with small, homelike facilities	4	735
Rights of children, including basic needs and education, require legal and other accountability of individuals and agencies responsible for providing them	5	618
Establishment of a child advocacy agency financed by the Federal government and other sources with full ethnic, cultural, racial and sexual representation	6	602
A Federally financed national child health care program which assures comprehensive care for all children	7	514
To enhance the self-worth of all children, and to achieve early population stabilization, we recommend consumer-determined, publicly funded programs of (1) family life, sex and population education, and (2) voluntary family planning services and safe abortion available to all	8	482
Resolved: The President immediately and unequivocally express his commitment to enforce existing legislation to end racism and discrimination	9	481
The establishment of a Department of Education with Cabinet status, backed by a National Institute of Education	10	430
Establish immediately a high-level, independent Office of Child Advocacy, with a network of local advocacy	11	427
Department of Family and Children with Cabinet status: state and local councils, all adequately funded	12	406
Comprehensive developmental programs for handicapped or potentially handicapped children from birth to six be mandatory	13	382

425

	Rating	No. of Votes
The United States can and must drastically reduce injuries—perinatal, traffic, poisoning, burns, malnutrition, rats—and provide health and safety education	14	364
Quality developmental child care requires thoroughly trained personnel and parent and community control of programs	15	337
Federal support for independent research and dissemination of information on existing and alternate forms of education	16	316
Establish a people-oriented, National Institute for the Family for action, advocacy, implementation, legislation and research	17	299
A Federally financed national child health care program which assures comprehensive care for all children	18	293
The right-to-read effort be established as a top national priority supported by special legislation and funding commensurate with its critical importance	19	271
Promote expressions of identity through physical-emotional identity learning, parent education, and an international children's year	20	270
It is essential for a national body to be formed to assure the implementation of the recommendations of the 1970 Children's Conference	21	259
That these words be included in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag: ". . . stands; *and dedicate myself to the task of making it one nation, . . .*"	22	196
That cross-cultural, participating experiences must be provided for *all* children so they may understand the concepts and goals of justice in terms of human relations; and that community decision-making processes and educational experiences must provide for the participation and knowledge necessary for a personal, realistic commitment to the democratic system	23	152
Establish a national task force to develop an Office of Leisure Services at Federal and state levels	24	120
In an effort to begin the process of improving the quality of life for children (some of whom we can each call by name) the members of Forum 20 (Child Development		

426

	Rating	No. of Votes
and Mass Media) are making such recommendations as to affect and implement many concerns regarding humane human development and the mass media. We are unwilling to suggest the relative dispensibility of any one of our recommendations. They are all urgent and affordable	25	80

427

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Establishment of a Child Advocacy Agency Financed by the Federal Government and Other Sources With Full Ethnic, Cultural, Racial and Sexual Representation	The Agency will be charged with the planning, the coordination, and the implementation of all programs related to the development of childhood identity. To foster this development the Agency will be especially concerned with programs which strengthen family life in any form it occurs. These programs will involve 1) education for parenting, which emphasizes the recognition of the uniqueness of every child, 2) the establishment of a National Commission to strengthen and enhance cultural pluralism, and 3) the development of community based comprehensive resource centers for families.
Establish Immediately a Cabinet Post of Children and Youth To Meet Needs of All Children	We strongly recommend that the President and Congress immediately establish a Department of Children and Youth at cabinet level, responsible directly to the President of the United States. This Department, with heavy youth involvement at policy level, would encompass all federal agencies and institutions dealing with children and youth, would protect and protect the needs and rights of children and youth, set forth all standards and monitor all federal, state, and local programs serving the needs of children. This Department is needed because children have not received the attention the time is now ripe to provide under the existing fragmented
Health, Nutrition, Education and Structural Problems Of Black Children Must Be Given Top Priority	The future of our children and their families has always been tied to that of Blacks. When the United States as such has a government that, with its best conscience, can mobilize forces in the private sector and in the military, then and only then will the future of our children, Black, America has not to be and indeed.
	We note with regret the [illegible] that [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Evidence should be applied equally to seeking change or seeking not to change. Provision must be made to protect the interests of everyone concerned and to guarantee that the development of alternatives not be an unwitting support of bigotry or segregation.

A Change in Our National Way of Life to Bring People Back Into the Lives of Children

We must change our national way of life so that children are no longer isolated from the rest of society. We call upon all our institutions—public and private—to initiate and expand programs that will bring adults back into the lives of children and children back into the lives of adults. This means the reinvolvement of children of all ages with parents and other adults in common activities and responsibilities. It means parent-child centers as opposed to child development centers. It means breaking down the wall between school and community. It means new flexibility for schools, business and industries so that children and adults can spend time together and become acquainted with each other's worlds at work and at play. It means family-directed community planning, services and recreation programs. It means the reinvolvement of children and adults in each other's lives.

Elimination of Racism Demands Many Meaningful Federal Programs, Particularly an Adequate Family Income Maintenance Floor

Racism, individual, institutional, and collective, that permeates American society has resulted in psychological and physical damage to its children—Black, brown, red, yellow, and white.

This racism has created an environment which hinders the learning capacity of all children, even those with special family resources.

Similarly, this racism has made it impossible for children to obtain the health services vital to their survival, growth, and development.

Removal of external handicaps to the family and support of internal strengths through Federally sponsored and financed programs acceptable to and designed by those families is of the highest priority.

Programs that deal with discrimination in employment and lack of access to financial resources should take priority over currently proclaimed programs.

The greatest injustice to children can be found in the failure to provide wholesome physical environments and services.

A position vote for this resolution by White House Conference on Children delegates is vital to all children.

Over [illegible]

A National Land Use Policy Must Be Developed To Guarantee The Quality of Urban Service, Open Spaces and the Natural Natural Resources for All Children

A national land use policy must encompass the total social and physical environment of children. A national land use policy must address itself to cities as well as to open spaces. A national land use policy must assure open air parks for recreation and leisure activities, for adequate housing, for public transportation systems, for sidewalks and bicycle paths, for learning centers (such as museums, theaters) and must address itself to pollution of air and water as well as to noise pollution.
The quality of life for a child is affected by the quality of his physical and social environment which must provide him with the daily experiences of adventure and basic experiences

Universal Developmental Child Care Without Sex Role Stereotyping Will Help to Eliminate Institutional, Individual Sexism

We demand:

A commitment to a network of quality child care developmental services for all children whose families seek them;

complete separation of all child welfare development services from public assistance programs;

condemnation of sexism—the belief that women and men must play separate sex-linked roles with women in a subordinated position;

censure of the White House Conference itself for demonstrating sexism through the domination of decision-making processes by men and execution of details by women;

flexible and/or shorter work week hours for women and men, to provide wider opportunities outside the home for women and more child care and home life for men;

For women, as for men, for girls as for boys, anatomy should be a part not the whole of one's identity and destiny. We urge unanimous adoption of this resolution.

Women's Caucus

All Institutions and Programs That Affect Children Must Involve Children as Active Participants in the Decision-making Process

Children are powerless people. Like other minority groups they are denied the basic right to participate in the decisions that govern their lives. Their dignity is smothered, needs go undetected, fresh ideas are lost, programs are mis-directed, and their decision-making capacities go undeveloped.

Perhaps there is no one quality more important for the developing self than a feeling of involvement in what is taking place. The lack of consultation and involvement is the cause of the continuing war between children and society. When the child is a part of something, then he becomes responsible.

If, for example, children, not just youth, had been included in the White House Conference as both delegates and planners, we might have come into sharper focus on their needs and at the same time have made an affirmative statement of their worth.

The Indian Representatives of this Conference Will Recommend That All Levels Embark on a Vigorous Practical Approach to Enhance the Future of our Children

American Indians are a unique people within American society, guaranteed by treaties, congressional laws and individual actions of United States Presidents. Violations of this relationship have been numerous because neither Congress nor the various United States Presidents have been active in carrying out the provisions of these guarantees. President Nixon has declared that certain innovations conducive to self-determination will be implemented by his administration.

The American Indian Caucus of the White House Conference on Children declares that the President should follow through with his stated POLICY of self-determination for American Indians without termination of government responsibilities with INDIAN wishes.

The American Indian takes pride in his land and desires to protect its physical and cultural environment from any outside exploitation.

American Indian Caucus

Specific Forum Recommendations	
Provide Opportunities for Every Child to Learn, Grow, and Live Creatively by Reordering National Priorities	The creative child whom we wish to nurture is curious, wonders and questions; seeks new experiences; is open to the world; independent and free from social and group pressures to conform at the cost of individuality; willing to risk error; play with ideas and experiment; willing to change and live with change. Such a child is in the heart of every child but presently our schools and communities are not providing the atmosphere and resources for the development of such creative persons. In response, we must foster in each community the development of total educational programs available to every child through a more diverse and flexible educational system, more creative approaches to learning, a stress on early childhood education, the expansion of cultural and creative learning centers, and the integration of aesthetic education in every school, institution and agency which serves children. Forum 4
Redesign Education to Achieve Individualized, Humanized, Child-centered Learning. We Support Proposed National Institute of Education with this Goal	A major redesign of education is urgent. Educational technology, defined as a logical process of learning design, can help achieve this goal. An overriding goal of redesign should be development of an educational system responding to the needs of individual learners through personalized evaluation, individualized learning, and the thorough preparation of all persons involved in their education. We specifically urge that legislation authorizing N.I.E. provide for applied research and development efforts in educational technology within the Institute and that educational technology be defined in this legislation as described in our report. A process which: A. Identifies needs of learners, individually and collectively B. Determines what must be done to meet those needs and considers alternative solutions and options C. Involves individual learner in selecting the best way to meet his needs D. Designs and implements the selected strategies and tools E. Evaluates their effectiveness F. Revises when necessary Forum 6
Establishment of Citizen Community Action Groups to Implement the Multitude of Excellent Recommendations Which Have Evolved Out of the White House Conference on Children	The White House Conference process is one of proposing and influencing the passage of legislation that will enhance the physical and social environment of children. While acknowledging the success of this process, it is our conclusion that no legislation, however commendable, can be a valuable instrument of social change unless a structure exists that extends the legislative process to a point that guarantees its provisions are implemented at the lowest level of society. Existing processes are not accomplishing this task adequately.

Therefore, it is urgent that procedures be created which guarantee that our efforts here become a tangible reality to children, and that our words become effective processes.

Young Americans, striving to accept the responsibilities of citizenship find few positions of responsibility open to them. It is our sense and that of many delegates at this conference, that a new thrust is imperative. We submit that the process described herein is one workable answer to this need: a mobilizing force at the grass roots level which is composed either of youth or of youth and concerned adults that will work for the CHILDREN—NOW!

Contemporary history indicates that the recent impact of youth upon our society has been one of conscience and sober responsibility.

Therefore, let it be resolved that: (A) A need exists for the construction of a power base that will serve as a booster to the existing concerns of our present youth and how they relate to our *Children—Now;* and for those currently in power at the local, state, and Federal levels to have an honest approach to change.

(B) Delegates to this conference be made to feel the necessity to continue the White House Conference process by committing themselves to activities of organization, mobilization, and sensitivity within their communities.

(C) That we cause to exist a body of people composed of two members of each of the forums of this conference.

(D) At least one of these must be a youth.

(E) Geographic, economic, and ethnic factors must be taken into consideration for selection.

(F) That this body be completely autonomous in nature. (G) That neither sanction, endorsement, or funding for this body be accepted if it in any way endangers its autonomy.

We suggest five options of initiating procedures at the community level:

(a) a working rapport with the White House Conference process

(b) utilization of existing youth organs.

(c) university-based urban studies coalition groups.

(d) National Community Programs, Inc.

(e) Community Self Starters.

We strongly feel that best potential for the new thrust is offered by the Self Starter method, but this requires a moral encouragement from a non-managerial existing body, and a cogent liaison with the delegates of this Conference.

It is imperative that there be a strong interaction with existing community organizations, responsible and effective.

These ideas apply not only to implementation of ideas to better the child's physical and social environment, but also in developing suggestions made by other forums in this Conference.

Forum 10

Reform Justice System; Emphasize Prevention and Protection; Replace Large Institutions with Small, Homelike Facilities	Children in trouble are crying for HELP! Prevention of abuse, neglect, and delinquency should be the top priority of this nation, and should be stressed by all citizens, officials, agencies and institutions. We believe the Federal government must assist state and local units of governments financially and in other ways in improving the juvenile justice system. All children in trouble and in need should be diverted from the justice system unless court proceedings are necessary to protect the child. No child under the age of 16 should be placed in a jail or penal institution. No child under 14 should be committed to a training school. Instead we recommend that small, home-like treatment-oriented facilities such as shelter homes, foster homes, youth homes, group homes, and half-way houses be developed and financed by Federal, state, local and private funds, and be staffed with trained, concerned personnel. Forum 23
Rights of Children, Including Basic Needs and Education, Require Legal and Other Accountability of Individuals and Agencies Responsible for Providing Them	Every child is entitled to good health and care from conception, and to at least minimum standards of food, shelter and clothing, and to effective education, in an environment of economic security. Individuals, agencies and public bodies offering these services to children have seldom been held legally accountable for ensuring competent performance. Therefore we recommend that methods of redress be established to hold accountable those who render services to children to a standard of care commensurate with the skill their profession requires, and to hold accountable those private and public bodies which fail to render adequate services to children. Forum 22
Establishment of a Child Advocacy Agency Financed by the Federal Government and Other Sources With Full Ethnic, Cultural, Racial and Sexual Representation	This Agency will be charged with the fostering, the coordination, and the implementation of all programs related to the development of childhood identity. To foster this development the Agency will be especially concerned with programs which strengthen family life in any form it occurs. These programs will involve 1) Education for parenting, which emphasizes the uniqueness of every child, 2) the establishment of a National Commission to strengthen and enhance cultural pluralism, 3) the development of community based comprehensive resource center for families. Forum 2
*A Federally Financed National Child Health Care Program Which Assures Comprehensive Care for All Children	We believe that this country is moving toward a more formalized national health program. It seems feasible that implementation be in stages, and we urge that children be given first priority. We, therefore, recommend that, as a first step, a Federally financed comprehensive child health care program be established. This program will require a stable, permanent, Federal financing mechanism, possible through a combination of payroll taxes and general tax revenues. Reimbursement procedures, including co-payment, must be designed to create incentives for more rational, organized, and efficient systems of health care delivery which stress illness prevention and health promotion. We also believe that this program and all Federal programs providing health care services to children should allocate a specific percentage of their budgets to help finance new resources in areas of critical need. Forum 10 (*See footnote references at top of page 192)

	Votes	Rank
* *Comprehensive Child Health Program* A Federally financed National Child Health Care Program which assumes comprehensive care for all children (17th item on list—by Forum 10)	540*	7
Identical recommendation (19th item on list—by Forum 11)	293	18
Combined gross total	833	5
Net total (less estimated overlapping vote of 17% of latter item or 50 votes	783	5

Corrected total as tabulated by Alexander Grant & Co., but erroneously reported on Press Release of Dec. 22, 1970, as 514.

To Enhance the Self-worth of All Children, and to Achieve Early Population Stabilization, We Recommend Consumer-determined, Publicly Funded Programs of (1) Family Life, Sex and Population Education, and (2) Voluntary Family Planning Services and Safe Abortion Available to All

It is the right of every child to know about his own sexuality and identity without the legal restrictions now imposed upon distribution of information and services to minors. Family life and sex education should be a multi-faceted approach including community involvement, information on methods of planning families, and emphasis on the uniqueness of each individual within his own family.

Family planning services are defined as services to all family members, including the education, comprehensive medical and social services necessary to permit individuals freely to determine and achieve the number and spacing of their children. Family planning services include contraception, sterilization, and abortion. The full range of services should be available to all, regardless of sex, age, marital status, economic group or ethnic origin; and should be administered in a noncoercive and nondiscriminatory manner.

We recommend a national program to educate all citizens in the problems of population growth, and to develop programs to achieve population stability. Population growth in the United States occurs primarily among affluent and middle class whites, and programs designed to achieve population stabilization should be directed to reducing their natality.

Forum 18

Received: The President Immediately and Unequivocally Expresses His Commitment to Enforce Existing Legislation to End Racism and Discrimination

The President should make the elimination of racism and all discrimination against minorities the No. 1 priority of this administration. We insist he address his moral authority as President to this issue in his State of the Union Address.

There is flagrant disrespect of law and order in this country when it comes to the rights of minority groups. Existing laws, treaties, and court decisions are not enforced, e.g., various Indian-American Treaties, the 1848 Guadalupe-Hidalgo Treaty. We are also concerned about the continuation of the concentration camp laws. We insist the President use his authority to enforce this legislation and these decisions.

Various reports have been made laying bare the present destructive results of racism and the incipient dangers. We urge that these reports—National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders U.S. Civil Rights Commission, Committee on Minority Group Children of the Joint Commission on the Mental Health of Children—be given the widest possible dissemination. We urge that their judicious recommendations, which might save our nation, be immediately implemented.

[illegible] Forum 10

The Establishment of a Department of Education with Cabinet Status, Backed by a National Institute of Education

to establish national education policies and to promote constructive change in present educational practices, with the over-riding purpose of developing each individual's potential to the fullest, and improving our society.

This requires substantial increases in Federal appropriations to achieve the following:

salvaging the growing number of school districts now on the verge of collapse.

providing massive implementation of what we know is good quality education as well as further experimentation through a wide variety of educational institutions, but insisting on public accountability.

We make this recommendation in light of our conviction that school is a concept, not a place, and that schooling and education are not synonymous.

Forum 5

Establish Immediately a High Level, Independent Office of Child Advocacy, with a Network of Local Advocacy

Forum 24 passed the following recommendations:

A. That the cost of the Child Advocacy program be paid from Federal tax monies, with provision for use of other supplemental funds, without the requirement for matching funds.

B. States, local communities and neighborhoods can develop their own programs. States which do not develop comprehensive plans and hence do not develop state councils would not receive Federal funds for state programs. The Federal law should provide that direct local or neighborhood grants for local planning could be made where no state council was developed or the National Child Advocacy office determines the state plan insufficient. Such direct local or neighborhood grants will not be subject to veto by state officials.

C. Local councils shall be so structured as to maintain effective citizen control while providing for active participation of community agencies and organizations concerned with the child.

Department of Family and Children With Cabinet Status; State and Local Councils, All Adequately Funded

Acknowledging that the family is society's primary unit for developing human potential and transmitting cultural heritage, we charge parents and children with enhancing their ability and responsibility to strengthen their own family life; furthermore

We recommend that a Department of the Family and Children with the status of a cabinet post and councils and commissions on state and local levels be established, adequately funded, and charged with the responsibility for:

coordinating services to families and children;

reconstructing old programs;

developing new programs; and performing other functions, such as:

convening a White House Conference on Families and Children at least every five years with ongoing activities in states and local communities with children participating at all levels;

supporting policies which provide for part-time employment without discrimination for parents who wish to spend more time with their children; and

assuring the right of all children to have legally responsible, permanent parents.

In the interim, we strongly urge increased support for the Office of Child Development.

Forum 15

Comprehensive Developmental Programs for Handicapped or Potentially Handicapped Children From Birth to Six be Mandatory

We affirm that complete comprehensive child health care should be recognized as a top priority for all children in the Nation. The child with handicapping conditions has often been denied his right to health care because of the difficulties in meeting his special needs. This recommendation will allow handicapped children to achieve the fulfillment of their potentials which is the right of all children.

Recommendation—

Inclusive within comprehensive health needs, diagnostic, treatment, and educational services be provided handicapped children without arbitrary barriers.

There are many programs for which legislation and authorization have been completed. We feel that full appropriation of all such legislation is an important first step in improving and expanding the potential of handicapped children. An example of such legislation is the recently enacted Developmental Disabilities Act (Public Law 91–517). Cognizant of the failure to appropriate authorized funds, we recommend the full appropriation of authorized funds for programs dealing with handicapping conditions, especially in those programs which focus on manpower training, the provision of services, and research.

Forum 18

The United States Can and Must Drastically Reduce Injuries—Perinatal, Traffic, Poisoning, Burns, Malnutrition, Rats and Provide Health and Safety Education

The top priority for this nation's development and utilization of its resources must be its children because:

1. They form the essential element of human, social, and economic progression;

2. The majority of this country has a vested interest in the well-being of its children;

3. Individually or collectively, they are unable to provide their own supportive political forces and power;

4. They are constantly changing but they continue to represent an essential element of our nation's present and future, and

5. They become, or are already, a truly disadvantaged majority without appropriate support.

With these tenets as a framework, the concept of children's injuries has been incorrectly defined, and consequently decisions relating to children's injuries have reflected a restricted perspective. Childhood injury encompasses interdependent physical, psychological, social and environmental factors.

Quality Developmental Child Care Requires Thoroughly Trained Personnel and Parent and Community Control of Programs

The two most important factors in insuring quality in developmental child care are adequate training of the personnel who work with the children and the responsiveness of the programs through parent and community control.

A massive increase in training efforts is essential to meet the goal of universal availability of developmental child care. Adequate funding to provide training for at least 50,000 additional child care workers must be added annually over the next decade. Training should be directed toward trainers, professional, paraprofessional, and volunteer staff who work directly with children, administrative and ancillary staff of child care programs, parents, and youth. A complete program should include training for parenthood in the public schools, started before the Junior High School level, and with opportunities for direct experience in day care centers. The training should include both male and female students.

True responsiveness of programs to insure quality can only be established by requiring control in individual programs by parents of the enrolled children. Parents and local communities must also control (1) local distribution of funds, (2) community planning and coordination, and (3) monitoring and licensing functions.

Forum 19

Federal Support For Independent Research and Dissemination of Information on Existing and Alternate Forms of Education

To encourage and support independent research relating to the development of those evaluative systems and processes designed to measure those aspects of human development which are not presently considered in the present system of public education.

To encourage and support independent investigations and critical evaluations of educational programs, motives, goals, systems, and practices currently in use, and/or suggested as experimental models for future use. Such a commission would consider for support studies and experiments designed to explore, for example, the extent and the validity of the alleged myths and stereotypes now governing our educational culture.

A national "information on educational alternatives" body which, using television, films, and other media, brings to parents, teachers, students, and communities, a more extensive understanding of the wealth of educational alternatives now available in the United States and elsewhere. (The body will be not only a central source of information, but an active dispenser of new information.)

Forum 4

Position a People-oriented, National Institute for the Family for Action, Advocacy, Implementation, Legislation and Research

Recognizing that the family is the dominant socializing agent and the primary interface between the individual and society, [illegible] central position must be considered by the White House Conference on Children in making recommendations for improving the well-being of our Nation's children.

It is vital that children living in all types of family structures (e.g., single parent, traditional, dual work, commune, etc.) have equally available options for self-fulfillment.

Present human service systems tend to fragment and undermine the family. All such delivery systems should be redirected to provide services and support through and to the family as a unit with recognition of the different needs, strengths and resources

of varying family forms. Therefore, we recommend that an Institute for the Family be established by the Congress as a quasi-public organization. The process for its operation should be assured by establishing a trust fund through a per capita assessment drawn from Federal taxes.

This Institute should have a broadly representative Board of Directors and be adequately staffed for carrying out its functions. These functions are:

1) Serve as an advocate for families and children;

2) Provide the mechanisms for assuring follow-up and implementation of the White House Conference recommendations at all levels;

3) Develop and support demonstration, action, research and evaluation programs which focus on building new environments for families and children; reorder existing services and programs to fit around desires and aspirations of families, and to involve families in their development and implementation;

4) Examine existing legislation for its effects on variant family forms;

5) Take action against legislation, regulations and practices which are punitive to children because of their discriminatory policies against the integrity of families or variant forms of parenting; and

6) Technical assistance to state and local programs for families and children.

Forum 14

A Federally Financed National Child Health Care Program Which Assures Comprehensive Care for All Children

We believe that this country is moving toward a more formalized national health program. It seems feasible that implementation be in stages, and we urge that children be given first priority. We, therefore, recommend that as a first step, a Federally financed comprehensive child health care program be established. This program will require a stable, permanent, Federal financing mechanism, possible through a combination of payroll taxes and general tax revenues. Reimbursement procedures, including pre-payment, must be designed to create incentives for more rational, organized, and efficient systems of health care delivery which stress illness prevention and health promotion. We also believe that this program and all Federal programs providing health care services to children should allocate a specific percentage of their budgets to help finance new resources in areas of critical need.

Forum 11

The Right to Read Effort Be Established As a Top National Priority Supported by Special Legislation and Funding Commensurate With Its Critical Importance

The single overriding goal of this recommendation is national literacy. For generations we have accepted as a fact that literacy is imperative to the survival of a democracy. As an ideal, nothing less than universal school attendance in the United States, we are decidedly short of universal literacy. The Right to Read Effort (launched in September of 1969) has made a beginning toward improvement. However, obstacles still remain. The effort needs to be strengthened, coordinated, and specifically funded on a scale commensurate with the job to be done. The goal requires national awareness of the problem; national coordination of research;

rapid improvement in teacher education; development of effective instructional materials; integration of school experiences with home and community resources; and adoption of modern management procedures within the education sector.

Forum 7

Promote Expressions of Identity Through Physical-emotional Identity Learning, Parent Education, and an International Children's Year

Whereas in our present society, complicated by cultures within cultures, many children experience insecurity, fear, and prejudice; and

Whereas a positive self-concept and a satisfactory realization of role are vital in a rapidly changing society;

We Propose to Federal, state, and local governments:

That programs be funded to encourage high priority for the affective learnings (those dealing with feelings and imagination) balancing the current emphasis on cognitive learnings (those dealing with factual knowledge); provide resources such as a cultural bank; and provide necessary teacher re-training.

That funding be provided for programs of Parent Education which offer new options in child rearing, conflict-resolution, and self-identity growth.

We propose to the United States Government and to the United Nations that these and other recommendations of the White House Conference on Children be promoted and celebrated through an International Children's Year comparable to the International Geophysical Year with a possible target date of 1975.

Forum 3

It is Essential for a National Body to be Formed to Assure the Implementation of the Recommendations of the 1970 Children's Conference.

Recommendation No. 21 does not have a back-up statement.

That These Words be Included in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag:

". . . stands; *and dedicate myself to the task of making it* one nation, . . ."

Our primary concern is that all Americans, concerned with the future of our children, join in faith and work to make the values expressed in our pledge of allegiance to the flag, a living fact in American life.

Under the administration of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Congress revised the pledge to the flag to include the phrase "under God." We recommend that it be further revised to read "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands; *and dedicate myself to the task of making it* one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

This would provide Americans of all ages, races and cultures with a realistic, affirmative pledge to deepen our common commitment to a truly free, truly responsible and truly united society.

441

Forum 4

Recommendations of Forum 25

Whereas we recognize that the American home, school, and community are failing to provide the examples, experiences, and knowledge that will teach *all* children about democratic values and processes, Forum 25 recommends:

That cross-cultural, participating experiences must be provided for *all* children so they may understand the concepts and goals of justice in terms of human relations;

And that community decision-making processes and educational experiences must provide for the participation and knowledge necessary for a personal, realistic commitment to the democratic system.

Establish a National Task Force to Develop an Office of Leisure Services at Federal and State Levels

This office shall have as its objectives and responsibilities promotion or administration of:

a. Education in the knowledge, attitudes, and skills for creative participation in leisure activities.

b. Coordination of resources and services relevant to leisure at all levels of organization, public and private.

c. The use of all educational media for the purpose of education in leisure.

d. Ensuring that availability of resources be equal for all, having in mind minority groups, socioeconomic level, and geographic lo-

e. Leisure resources and activities should be used to strengthen rather than fragment family life.

f. Involvement of children and youth at the community level in decision-making regarding use of leisure resources.

g. Education in the importance of the total physical environment. cation.

h. Standards for personnel, services, and facilities.

i. Long-term research and development relevant to leisure and its role in survival and enrichment of human life.

j. Ensuring that leisure resources are included in all public and private land and urban developments.

The President and the respective governors should immediately appoint task forces representative of children, minority groups, and the broad areas of leisure activities to develop plans for the implementation and operation of the offices and to serve as ongoing advisory groups.

Forum 21

In an effort to begin the process of improving the quality of life for children (some of whom we can each call by name) the members of Forum 20 (Child Development .nd Mass Media) are making such recommendations as to affect and implement many concerns regarding humane human development and the mass media. We are unwilling to suggest the relative dispensibility of any one of our recomendations. They are all urgent and affordable

442 Forum 20

PROFILES OF CHILDREN
(Selected Charts)

Table 13.
Deaths Under One Year Per 1,000 Live Births, by Race, in specified group: United States, 1935-1969
(Chart 80)

Year	Total	White	Other
1935	55.7	51.9	83.2
1936	57.1	52.9	87.6
1937	54.4	50.3	83.2
1938	51.0	47.1	79.1
1939	48.0	44.3	74.2
1940	47.0	43.2	73.8
1941	48.3	41.2	74.8
1942	40.4	37.3	64.6
1943	40.4	37.5	62.5
1944	39.8	36.9	60.3
1945	38.3	35.8	57.0
1946	33.8	31.8	49.5
1947	32.2	30.1	48.5
1948	32.0	29.9	46.5
1949	31.3	28.9	47.3
1950	29.2	26.8	44.5
1951	28.4	25.8	44.8
1952	28.4	25.5	47.0
1953	27.9	25.0	44.7
1954	26.6	23.9	42.9
1955	26.4	23.6	42.8
1956	26.0	23.2	42.1
1957	26.3	23.3	43.7
1958	27.1	23.8	45.7
1959	26.4	23.2	44.0
1960	26.0	22.9	43.2
1961	25.3	22.4	40.7
1962	25.3	22.3	41.4
1963	25.2	22.2	41.5
1964	24.8	21.8	41.1
1965	24.7	21.5	40.3
1966	23.7	20.8	38.8
1967	22.4	19.7	35.9
1968[1]	21.8	19.2	34.5
1969[1]	20.7		

[1] Provisional

U. S. Department of Health, Education,and Welfare
Health Services and Mental Health Administration
National Center for Health Statistics

Page 90

Table 14.
Infant Mortality Rates: Selected Countries: 1968
(Rates are deaths under one year of age per 1,000 live births)
(Chart 81)

Rank	Country	Rate
1	Sweden (1967)	12.9
2	Netherlands (1967)	13.4
3	Finland	14.0*
4	Norway (1968)	14.6
5	Japan (1967)	15.0*
6	Denmark (1967)	15.8*
7	Switzerland (1967)	17.5
8	Australia (1967)	18.3
9	New Zealand	18.7
10	United Kingdom	18.8*
11	Eastern Germany	20.4*
12	France	20.4*
13	UNITED STATES (1968)	21.7*
14	Canada (1967)	22.0
15	Federal Rep. of Germany (1967)	22.8
16	Czechoslovakia (1967)	22.9*
17	Belgium (1967)	23.4*
18	Ireland (1967)	24.4
19	Singapore (1967)	24.8
20	Austria	25.5*
21	Israel (1967)	25.9
22	Bulgaria	28.2*
23	Jamaica (1967)	31.0*
24	Spain	32.0*
25	Italy (1967)	32.9*
26	Greece	34.4*
27	Hungary (1967)	37.0
28	Poland (1967)	38.1
29	Trinidad and Tobago (1968)	41.6
30	Ceylon (1968)	53.2
31	Portugal (1967)	59.2
32	Romania	59.5
33	Yugoslavia (1967)	61.4*
34	El Salvador (1967)	63.1
35	Mexico (1967)	63.1
36	Costa Rica (1968)	69.9
37	Albania (1965)	86.8
38	Guatemala (1968)	91.5*
39	Chile (1967)	98.9

*Provisional

NOTE: This table is limited to sovereign countries with estimated populations of one million or more, and with "complete" counts of live births and infant deaths, as indicated in the 1968 *Demographic Yearbook* of the United Nations.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Health Services and Mental Health Administration, National Center for Health Statistics

Page 91

PROFILES OF CHILDREN
(Selected Charts)

Table 59.
Percent Age Distribution of Abused Children: United States, 1967, 1968
(Chart 117)

Male & Female	Extent	
	1967 N-5, 993	1968 N-6, 617
Under 6 mos.	8.0 percent	8.1 percent
6 mos. to 1 yr.	5.8	5.5
1 to 2 yrs.	10.6	10.8
2 to 3 yrs.	9.4	9.4
3 to 6 yrs.	20.1	19.9
6 to 9 yrs.	18.2	15.1
9 to 12 yrs.	11.4	12.2
12 to 15 yrs.	10.5	10.8
15 yrs. and over	6.3	5.6
Age unknown		2.6

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare Survey Funded by Children's Bureau. Study, *Physical Abuse of Children in the U.S.*, Dr. David Gil, Brandeis University.

Page 112

Table 64.
School Enrollment by Level, Race, and Residence in Poverty Areas: United States, October 1969

(Numbers in Thousands)
(Charts 99,126)

Level and Race	Total Enrolled	Reside in poverty areas of metropolitan areas of 250,000 or more	
		Number	Percent
White			
Nursery school	678	18	2.7
Kindergarten	2,900	139	5.0
Elementary school	28,572	1,376	4.8
Negro			
Nursery school	170	51	30.0
Kiddergarten	425	147	34.6
Elementary school	4,786	1,372	28.7

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Table 65.
Population of 3 and 4 Year Old Children Living in Poverty Areas of 250,000 or More, and Enrollment in Nursery School, by Race: United States, Cirtober 1969 (Chart 99)
116

	Total Population	Enrollment Number	Percent
White	328,000	34,000	10.6
Negro	387,000	119,000	30.9

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Page 116

PROFILES OF CHILDREN
(Selected Charts)

Table 66.
Nursery School and Kindergarten Enrollment by Control of School and Family Income: United States, October 1969

(Numbers in Thousands)
(Chart 98)

Family Income	Total Enrolled		Public	Private	Percent Distribution		
	%	Number			Total Enrolled	Public	Private
Total	100.0	5,144	2,934	1,210	100.0	70.8	29.2
Under $3,000	5.8	241	216	25	100.0	89.6	10.4
$3,000 to $4,999	9.2	382	311	71	100.0	81.4	18.6
$5,000 to $7,499	20.2	836	636	200	100.0	76.1	23.9
$7,500 to $9,999	22.7	939	692	247	100.0	73.7	26.3
$10,000 to $14,999	24.0	993	653	340	100.0	65.8	34.2
$15,000 and over	11.1	461	226	235	100.0	49.0	51.0
Income not reported	7.0	292	200	92	100.0	68.5	31.5

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Table 67.
School Enrollment by Level of School, and Type of Control, and Age: United States, October 1969 and 1964

(Numbers in Thousands. Minus sign (–) denotes decrease)
(Charts 94–95)

Level of school and type of control	1969	1964	Percent increase, 1964 to 1969
Total enrolled, 3 to 34 years old	59,913	52,490	14.1
Level and type of control:			
Nursery	860	471	82.6
Public	245	91	169.2
Private	615	380	61.8
Kindergarten	3,276	2,830	15.8
Public	2,682	2,349	14.2
Private	594	481	23.5
Elementary school (grades 1 to 8)			
Public	33,788	31,734	6.5
Private	29,825	26,811	11.2
	3,964	4,923	–19.5
Age:			
3 years old	313	182	73.1
4 years old	880	619	42.2
5 years old	3,129	2,846	9.9
6 years old	4,038	4,038	(Z)
7 to 13 years old	28,844	26,725	7.9

(Z) Less than 0.05 percent.
U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Table 68.
Nursery School and Kindergarten Pupils by Full-Day Attendance and Race: United States, October 1969
(Chart 97)

Level and race	Total Enrolled	Enrolled Full-Day	
		Number	Percent
White			
Nursery school	676,000	160,000	23.7
Kindergarten	2,800,000	227,000	8.1
Negro			
Nursery school	170,000	90,000	53.2
Kindergarten	425,000	113,000	26.6

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

PROFILES OF CHILDREN
(Selected Charts)

Table 69.
School Enrollment by Age, Residence and Race: United States, October 1969

(Numbers in Thousands)

(Chart 96)

Age, race and residence	Total Population	Enrolled in School	
		Number	Percent
White			
3 and 4 years	6,172	934	15.1
5 and 6 years	6,792	6,086	89.2
7 to 9 years	10,866	10,598	98.4
10 to 13 years	14,091	13,973	99.2
Metropolitan—Central Cities			
3 and 4 years	1,451	249	17.2
5 and 6 years	1,546	1,394	90.1
7 to 9 years	2,325	2,300	99.0
10 to 13 years	2,997	2,971	99.1
Metropolitan—Outside Central Cities			
3 and 4 years	2,413	440	18.2
5 and 6 years	2,741	2,517	91.8
7 to 9 years	4,392	4,375	99.6
10 to 13 years	5,887	5,831	99.2
Non-Metropolitan			
3 and 4 years	2,308	245	10.6
5 and 6 years	2,504	2,145	85.6
7 to 9 years	3,950	3,923	99.3
10 to 13 years	5,427	5,380	99.1
Negro			
3 and 4 years	1,140	242	21.2
5 and 6 years	1,190	1,001	84.1
7 to 9 years	1,772	1,731	98.8
10 to 13 years	2,171	2,151	99.1
Metropolitan—Central Cities			
3 and 4 years	629	160	25.4
5 and 6 years	632	578	91.2
7 to 9 years	982	974	99.1
10 to 13 years	1,182	1,168	98.8
Metropolitan—Outside Central Cities			
3 and 4 years	169	47	28.0
5 and 6 years	185	148	89.3
7 to 9 years	249	244	97.7
10 to 13 years	332	328	98.8
Non-Metropolitan			
3 and 4 years	343	35	10.1
5 and 6 years	394	277	70.4
7 to 9 years	540	534	98.7
10 to 13 years	656	656	99.7

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Table 71.
Project Head Start: Children and Family Information

(Percents)

(Charts 108-109)

Children	Full Year 1968	Summer 1968	Full Year 1969	Summer 1969
1. Age	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
a. Under 3 years	2.5	0.5	1.8	0.5
b. 3-3 yr. 11 mos.	17.8	3.2	14.8	5.1
c. 4-4 yr. 11 mos.	43.2	20.2	47.0	20.0
d. 5-5 yr. 11 mos.	31.0	40.1	31.6	40.9
e. 6 yrs. and older	3.0	33.6	3.6	32.1
f. Not reported	2.3	2.4	1.3	1.4
2. Sex	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
a. Male	52.5	51.4	50.4	50.5
b. Female	47.3	48.5	49.5	49.4
c. Not reported	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
3. Ethnic/Cultural Group	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
a. Caucasian	33.4	38.0	33.5	43.4
b. Negro	51.0	37.2	52.8	37.0
c. Oriental	0.3	0.0	0.2	0.1
d. American Indian	2.3	1.2	2.6	1.0
e. Mexican-American	8.8	10.2	10.0	8.8
f. Puerto Rican	4.6	0.6	5.8	3.9
g. Eskimo	0.8	0.3	0.3	0.0
h. Other	1.0	5.9	0.8	1.4
i. Not reported	4.3	6.5	4.3	4.4

The Bureau of the Census approximate 5% sample in full year and 1% sample of children in summer Head Start programs.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Office of Child Development

PROFILES OF CHILDREN
(Selected Charts)

Table 92.
Labor Force Participation Rates of Mothers,[1] by Age of Children: United States, 1948-69
(Chart 100)

Year	With children under 6[2]	With children 6-17 only
March 1969	30.4	49.7
March 1964	24.5	45.8
March 1960	20.2	42.5
March 1956	17.9	39.9
April 1952	15.7	35.1
April 1948	12.9	30.7

[1] "Mothers" refers to married women, husband present or absent, widows, and divorcees.
U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Table 93.
Ever-Married Women, with Children 6-17 Years Only and Under 6 Years, and in Labor Force: United States, 1949-59-69
(Chart 101)

Age of children	March 1969	March 1959	April 1949
	Number in population		
Mothers with children under 18 years, Total	28,421	25,936	21,308
With children 6 to 17 years only	14,539	11,633	8,816
With children under 6 years[1]	13,883	14,303	12,492
	Number in Labor force		
Mothers with children under 18 years, Total	11,599	7,964	4,233
With children 6 to 17 years only	7,376	5,007	2,710
With children under 6 years[1]	4,223	2,957	1,523
	Labor force participation rate		
Mothers with children under 18 years, Total	40.8	30.7	20.2
With children 6 to 17 years only	50.7	43.0	30.7
With children under 6 years[1]	30.4	20.7	13.0

[1] May also have older children.
U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics; Special Labor Force Reports.

Table 94.
Labor Force Participation Rates and Percent Distribution of Mothers (Husband Present), by Income of Husband in 1968 and Age of Children, March 1969: United States
(Chart 102)

Income of husband	(Mothers 16 years of age and over)					
	Labor force participation rates of mothers with children			Percent distribution of mothers in the labor force with children		
	Under 18 years	6-17 years only	Under 6 years[1]	Under 18 years	6-17 years only	Under 6 years[1]
Number	—	—	—	9,742,000	6,140,000	3,586,000
Percent	38.6	48.6	28.5	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under $1,000	48.2	59.9	31.4	2.2	2.6	1.6
$1,000 to $1,999	46.8	56.2	38.0	2.5	2.3	2.6
$2,000 to $2,999	46.9	52.1	30.8	3.1	3.0	3.4
$3,000 to $4,999	43.1	55.0	34.1	13.2	11.4	16.1
$5,000 to $6,999	44.7	55.6	35.7	23.4	20.8	28.0
$7,000 to $9,999	46.1	52.4	28.3	32.0	32.5	31.2
$10,000 and over	29.9	38.4	18.3	23.5	27.5	16.8

[1] May also have older children.
U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics; Special Labor Force Reports.

Table 95.
Labor Force Participation Rates of Married Women, Husbands Present, by Presence and Age of Children, and by Race: United States, March 1969
(Chart 103)

Presence and age of children	Labor force participation rates		Negro and other races as percent of all married women in the labor force
	Negro and other races	White	
Total	51.0	38.0	10.5
Children 6 to 17 years only	63.3	47.3	10.5
Children under 6 years[1]	44.3	35.8	10.2
None under 3 years	51.8	32.9	14.5
Some under 3 years	39.3	32.6	16.0
No children under 18 years	48.2	40.4	8.5

[1] May also have other children.
U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics; Special Labor Force Reports.

PROFILES OF CHILDREN
(Selected Charts)

Table 110.
Child Care Arrangements of Working Mothers[1] with Children Under 14 Years of Age, by Age of Children: United States, February 1965

(Percent Distribution)

(Chart 104)

Type of Arrangement	Total	Age of Children		
		Under 6 Years	6 to 11 Years	12 and 13 Years
Number (in thousands)	12,287	3,794	6,091	2,401
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Care in child's own home by—	45.5	47.1	46.9	38.1
Father	14.9	14.4	15.4	14.3
Other relative	21.2	17.5	23.2	20.9
Under 16 years	4.6	2.1	6.1	4.7
16 years and over	16.6	15.3	17.1	16.2
Nonrelative who only looked after children	4.7	8.4	3.8	1.2
Nonrelative who usually did additional household chores	4.7	6.9	4.4	1.7
Care in someone else's home by—	15.7	30.7	11.0	4.8
Relative	7.8	14.9	5.2	3.3
Nonrelative	8.0	15.8	5.8	1.5
Other arrangements	38.8	22.1	42.1	57.0
Care in group care center	2.2	5.6	.6	.4
Child looked after self	8.1	.5	8.0	20.7
Mother looked after child while working	13.0	15.0	12.5	11.1
Mother worked only during child's school hours	15.0	.8	20.5	24.2
Other	.5	.3	.6	.7

[1] Refers to mothers who worked either full or part time for 27 weeks or more in 1964.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Children's Bureau, and U.S. Department of Labor, Wage and Labor Standards Administration, Women's Bureau.

Table 111.
Licensed, or Approved Day Care Centers and Family Day Care Homes, Number and Capacity: United States, 1965-1969

(Chart 105)

Year	Total		Day Care Centers		Family Day Care Homes	
	Number	Capacity	Number	Capacity	Number	Capacity
1965	23,700	310,000	7,300	252,000	16,400	58,400
1967	34,700	475,000	10,400	393,000	24,300	81,900
1968	39,100	535,000	11,700	438,000	27,450	97,200
1969	46,300	639,000	13,600	518,000	32,700	120,000

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Social and Rehabilitation Service
National Center for Social Statistics

148

Page 148

Table 140.
Project Head Start Statistical Fact Sheet, Fiscal Years 1965-1970

(Dollars in Millions)

(Chart 107)

Fiscal Year Budget	Total Dollars	Summer Programs			Full-Year Programs		
		Children	Dollars	No. of Grants	Children	Dollars	No. of Grants
1965	$ 96.4	561,000	$ 85.0	2,397	No full-year programs in 1965		
1966	198.9	573,000	98.0[2]	1,645	180,000	$ 81.9	470
1967	348.2	486,000	116.6[3]	1,249	215,000	210.4	750
1968	316.2	478,000	91.0	1,185	218,000	192.0	719
1969	333.9[4]	447,000	90.2	1,100	217,000	212.3[5]	734
1970	324.0	230,800	46.1[6]	1,107	257,700[7]	227.5[8]	771

[1] An additional $14 million was obligated out of FY '67 to supplement the FY '66 Summer programs in nine large cities.

[2] Forward funding of $5.5 million accrued in FY '68 in order for some programs to operate through FY '69 and to be refunded in FY '70.

[3] Includes $5.0 million supplemental funds appropriated in FY '68.

[4] Based on conversion estimates submitted by Regions in April 1970.

[5] Based on assumption that carryover will be 5 percent. COB from FY '69 will be retained by OEO. Additional NOA will be required in FY '70 to meet Full Year and Summer Head Start needs.

[6] Includes $10.0 million for experimental programs.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Child Development

Page 173